

**APPENDIX H: Comment-Response Matrix from  
Public Hearing/Notice of Availability of the DEIS**

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1	4/20/2023	A R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2	3/30/2023	A T	Online	<p>Firstly, Plan A would not provide a direct route from east to west, which is the main problem that this highway is trying to solve. Instead, it would only provide a route from north to south, which would not effectively reduce traffic congestion for the majority of the people living in the area. Secondly, Plan A would cost significantly more than Plan B due to the additional land acquisition costs and construction expenses. This is not a cost-effective solution, especially when Plan B is available and meets the needs of the community at a lower cost. Furthermore, Plan A would require a significantly larger amount of land acquisition, which would result in the displacement of more people and properties. This would be detrimental to the affected individuals and the surrounding community. Based on the available evidence, Plan B is the most cost-effective and environmentally friendly solution that would effectively alleviate traffic congestion and improve traffic flow. I VOTE PLAN B</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. You can find information about the traffic analysis conducted for the Blue Alternative in the DEIS. Please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
3	3/16/2023	Aaron Kannowski	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
4	3/14/2023	Aaron Parkins	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Thank you, Aaron Parkins</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
5	3/30/2023	Abhi R	Email	<p>Dear Texas Department of Transportation</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed 380 Bypass highway project, specifically with regards to the portion that will span the cities of McKinney and Prosper, known as Route A and Route B. While the TX DOT has stated that the purpose of this project is to manage congestion, improve traffic flow, and enhance safety, it has come to my attention that there are two plans for the end of the highway, and that Plan A is not the best option for taxpayers and residents. Plan A is problematic as it would require the highway to go through just one city, at a higher expense to the taxpayer, and would not bypass as much of the major roadway. This plan would force the road to run from north to south, which is not ideal for alleviating traffic from east to west. In contrast, Plan B is the most cost-effective option, as it would go mostly through McKinney and run through Plano for about a mile. Plan B would bypass Highway 380, avoid cutting off the entire community of Tucker Hill from the city, and displace only an additional 3 residences, a horse farm, and "planned" communities, a minimal impact considering the scope of the project and future implications for efficiency and safety. I am concerned that special interests in Prosper are putting pressure on the government to build the more expensive and inefficient highway, despite the fact that its residents will also benefit from the bypass. It is unethical for Prosper to insist that it does not bear any land annexation when its residents will enjoy traffic relief as well. Plan A reduces the efficacy of every major stated goal of the DOT. As taxpayers and residents, we must look at the long-term benefits and costs of each plan. Plan B is the best option as it is more cost-effective and better meets the need for bypassing Highway 380, improving east-west traffic flow, and enhancing safety. We must consider the impact that the project will have on the community and the environment for decades to come. Therefore, I urge the Texas Department of Transportation, McKinney, and Prosper to build Plan B.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix. Our comparison of Segments A and B showed that there was not a substantial difference in traffic metrics such as travel times, travel speeds, and Level of Service.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
6	3/31/2023	Abhin R	Email	<p>Dear Texas DOT, I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed 380 Bypass highway project, specifically the portion that will span the cities of McKinney and Prosper known as Route A and Route B. While I understand that the purpose of this project is to manage congestion, improve traffic flow, and enhance safety, I would like to bring to your attention the issues with Plan A and the advantages of Plan B. Firstly, Plan A would not provide a direct route from east to west, which is the main problem that this highway is trying to solve. Instead, it would only provide a route from north to south, which would not effectively reduce traffic congestion for the majority of the people living in the area. Secondly, Plan A would cost significantly more than Plan B due to the additional land acquisition costs and construction expenses. This is not a cost-effective solution, especially when Plan B is available and meets the needs of the community at a lower cost. Furthermore, Plan A would require a significantly larger amount of land acquisition, which would result in the displacement of more people and properties. This would be detrimental to the affected individuals and the surrounding community.</p> <p>On the other hand, Plan B would provide a direct route from east to west, which would effectively reduce traffic congestion and improve traffic flow. It would also have a lower environmental impact since it would bypass highway 380, reducing air pollution and noise pollution for the community. Lastly, Plan B would be more beneficial for the community in the long term as it would not require as much maintenance as Plan A. This is because Plan B would bypass the existing highways, reducing the wear and tear on them and resulting in a longer lifespan for the new highway. In conclusion, I urge the Texas Department of Transportation, McKinney, and Prosper to carefully consider the advantages and disadvantages of both Plan A and Plan B. Based on the available evidence, Plan B is the most cost-effective and environmentally friendly solution that would effectively alleviate traffic congestion and improve traffic flow. Therefore, I strongly recommend that you proceed with Plan B and ensure that the taxpayers' money is spent wisely. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Abhin</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix. Our comparison of Segments A and B showed that there was not a substantial difference in traffic metrics such as travel times, travel speeds, and Level of Service.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
7	3/14/2023	Abisola Ogunseinde	Email	NO to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
8	2/17/2023	Adam Gilbert	Email	<p>Hello,                      My name is Adam Gilbert and I would like to voice my opposition to the 380 bypass (route C). The bypass would destroy the property owned by a good friend. This property serves as a place for therapeutic horse riding, community rides, events, and church services. The bypass would go directly through the riding arena and honey bee area on the property, and the noise from the highway would be incredibly detrimental to the animals. I would instead like to voice support of route D. It crosses through the flood plain, and would only disrupt 7 homes instead of 29. Thank you for listening, and I hope you will consider the impact of route C on the people and animals that call the area home.                      Thank you,                      Adam Gilbert, CIA, CISA, CISSP</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are also comparable. Segment C does impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p>
9	3/16/2023	Adela Seal	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
10	2/16/2023	Adele Ichilian	Email	<p>Mr. Endres:                      I am a 77 year old (recently) retired Equestrian who loves horses and wildlife. Although I live in Dallas, I have always spent a good amount of time in Collin County. I am concerned about the proposed bypass to 1827. The Blue Alternative with segments A+E+C is not a good idea. Segment C is going to affect many people's homes and businesses, including horse barns, not to mention the habitats for wildlife which is also important to me (as I am a volunteer Keeper Aide at the Dallas Zoo). It is my understanding that Segment D is a much better alternative. It would destroy acres and acres of natural habitats of wildlife including woods and wetlands in Collin County. It's my understanding that Texas Parks and Wildlife also opposes Segment C. Please consider these problems more seriously and please do not move forward in Segment C.                      Thank you.                      A. Adele Ichilian                      214 738 2931                      [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are also comparable. Segment C does impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. It outlines that for an EIS project, TxDOT is supposed to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things that TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
11	4/20/2023	Adelle S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The right thing to do is bypass Custer Rd congestion.	Your comment is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
12	4/20/2023	Aditi S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>NO TO SEGMENT A                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.                      Sincerely,</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
13	4/20/2023	Adrienne K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>What is the path of least resistance and would cause the least amount of collateral damage...oppose segment A</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
14	3/16/2023	Aki Bastian Pillai	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
15	4/20/2023	Al S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>As a taxpayer &amp; Stonebridge resident that often visits family in Tucker Hill, I adamantly oppose Segment A. It's costly, will increase area taxes, will make my nearby commute to Tucker Hill &amp; the hospital &amp; doctors offices more dangerous, more difficult &amp; extend my commute time. Segment A disrupts more residences &amp; business' and could be catastrophic to area lives. I urge TXDot to go with Segment B.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
16	4/20/2023	Albert D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
17	4/20/2023	Albert K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A and Yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
18	4/20/2023	Albert S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
19	3/16/2023	Albot Kramer	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
20	2/19/2023	Alee Ladd	Email	<p>Dear Stephen,</p> <p>My name is Alee Ladd. My mother-in-law, Debi Ladd, owns Avalon Legacy Ranch. We're on 25 acres located on FM 2933 and Wayside Trail in McKinney, TX. Our ranch hosts weddings, corporate events, church day retreats and celebrations. On average, we host over 100 weddings a year, each wedding brings in an average of 150 guests. These guests book hotels in McKinney, spend money at local restaurants, book Ubers/Lyfts, purchase clothing and trinkets from shops in Downtown- the list is endless. Our brides and grooms spend thousands of dollars each wedding on McKinney caterers, florists, DJs and planners. The average wedding costs around \$30,000+ in DFW according to research reports done by The Knot and Wedding Wire (<a href="https://www.theknot.com/content/average-wedding-cost">https://www.theknot.com/content/average-wedding-cost</a>). We love McKinney, we love our couples and they show their love by pouring money into our wonderful little city and the locals who live there and work as hard as we do to make their wedding dreams turn into reality. We are one family owned business. The proposed bypass will greatly harm us- the loss of land, the noise pollution, the length of construction all will be incredibly detrimental to our livelihood here. I urge you to consider option D. Option C is truly catastrophic. Please allow us to continue making dreams come true. Option C truly will turn a dream wedding into a nightmare. Feel free to call me with any questions or concerns, my cell is 817-223-2992.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration for what is best for the majority and not the minority.</p> <p>Alee Ladd  Avalon Legacy Ranch  Operations Manager   Wedding Alchemist  2022 Wayside Trail McKinney, TX 75071  2020 - 2023 The Knot Hall Of Fame  2015 - 2023 Best Of The Knot  2017 - 2023 Wedding Wire Couple's Choice  2017 - 2023 Best Small Business  *Please note that we are out of office Mondays &amp; Wednesdays</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. A noise barrier near the provided address does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
21	3/14/2023	Alejandra Quiroga De De Leon	Online (2)	<p>Mr. Endres,                      As a homeowner and citizen of the City of McKinney, TX, I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A for the US380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, impact fewer business and residential properties and result in less overall disruption to more than 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and several thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. Respectfully, I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM1827. Sincerely,                      Alejandra Quiroga De De Leon                      6421 Falcon Ridge Ln                      McKinney, TX, 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
22	4/20/2023	Aleksejs B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to Segment A - Yes to Segment B.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>
23	4/19/2023	Alessia Essig	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Best Regards,                      Alessia Essig                      (469) 781-0510                      [REDACTED]                      Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
24	3/10/2023	Alex Milano	Online	In regard to Segment A vs Segment B, the comparison used for the recommendation is deficient because it does not address the impact to traffic on US 380 during the period of construction. Segment B can be built from the NE to the SW, with the tie-in to the existing US 380 right of way occurring at the final stage of construction, thus allowing traffic to flow normally for the majority of the project. By comparison, Segment A impacts a much longer extent of existing roadway, necessitating a substantial impact to traffic during the build phase. Since the purpose of the project is to alleviate a major traffic bottleneck, the feasibility comparison cannot be complete without a comparison of the impact of the project's execution on the end it pursues. The absence of this comparison in the draft EIS are substantial grounds to revisit the decision. As is the \$200M more in cost. If A is chosen which I reject, we'd like sound walls, depressed roadway. Low speed on the frontage road.	Your comment is noted. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.
25	3/13/2023	Alex Milano	Email	I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. Regards, Alex Milano	This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023, instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.  Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
26	4/20/2023	Alex T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	why select the most expensive option?	Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
27	4/20/2023	Alex T. Milano	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, Please see attached. Thank you. Regards, Alex T. Milano   Major Case Specialist   Strategic Resolution Group Travelers PO Box 2902 Hartford, CT 06104-2902 W: 214.570.6144 F: 877.817.8748</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
28	2/20/2023	Alex W. Toskovich	Email	<p>What is the noise impact to the Stonebridge Ranch community from 380 going south on Stonebridge Ranch Rd every 1000 ft up to 1 mile. ? Fill in the blanks 1000ft___; 2000ft___; 3000ft___; 4000ft___; 5000ft (increase in db) - ps. negligible is not an answer. Also, what is the expected estimated increase in traffic on Stonebridge ranch rd after completion. ?</p>	<p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A noise barrier near the provided address does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>Traffic projections can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS. They are also listed on the schematic design roll plots.</p>
29	3/16/2023	Alexey Silin	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
30	4/6/2023	Alfred Goh	Email	<p>Dear Stephen,                      I am writing to express my opposition to the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT) plans to acquire my business and other properties for bypass road construction. This plan will disrupt the lives of countless small businesses and their employees in the state of Texas. Not only will these businesses have to relocate, but also their customers and employees will be impacted to some degree, as well. Furthermore, the value of these properties is typically much lower than their actual worth, which means that the businesses will not receive a fair compensation for the property acquired. This could lead to financial hardship for many business owners as well as my property. I urge TxDOT to reconsider their plans to acquire business properties for their projects. I believe there are other ways (Segment B) to achieve the same or better goals without negatively impacting the livelihoods of so many Texans. I strongly oppose acquiring my property because it will lead to hardship to my family. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely                      Alfred Goh, MBA                      Principal                      380 Century Star LLC                      (972) 489 - 3880                      [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.</p>
31	4/20/2023	Alfred R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A. Yes to Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
32	4/1/2023	Alice and Ken Halsor	Email	<p>TXDOT I support segment B                      And strongly oppose segment A                      See pdf attachment below                      Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone                      As a resident of Wren Creek on Harvest Hill Ln, I am very concerned about the construction of segment A and the potential impact it would have on our lifestyle. Currently we hear much noise from 380—as the breaks in the current sound wall (at either end of my street) are letting a tremendous amount of sound in, which filters down to the middle areas on my street as well. It is mostly noticeable during the day when the trucks are out in force. I would not want to remain in my home if the super-highway is built and the noise were to double or worse. The added pollution is also a huge concern. But why is segment A the chosen option? Here is your slide from the most recent presentation to the public. Why are planned future/proposed residences considered more important than actual existing residences? Plans can change. They change all the time. Future</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>residents are not yet vested. This project has a huge potential impact on so many families in at least 5 neighborhoods that border 380. Families that do not want added pollution, noise, or construction noise/detours/headaches disturbing their everyday lives for months -years. Families who have invested their life-savings already into the their homes. Totally vested. It makes no sense to uproot so many businesses and impact the lives of so many established family residences when Segment B costs so much less and will not go through an established area. Your own data supports Segment B. Segment A does a huge disservice to the city of McKinney. We want to continue to enjoy our life here in Wren Creek. The construction noise and detours would be devastating—even windows would not keep out that kind of noise. Our neighborhood has many retired folks like myself who are home during the day. Segment B is a much more practical solution that would not affect near the number of ALREADY ESTABLISHED families and businesses. And it's so much less expensive. If these reasons aren't compelling enough, there is a huge tax burden placed on the city of McKinney of \$120+ million dollars that will be handed off to taxpayers. And WE DON'T WANT IT! Choose wisely, TxDOT. We do not want a giant super-highway going through West McKinney!</p> <p>Sincerely, Alice &amp; Ken Halsor Wren Creek Residents</p>	<p>quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p>
33	4/20/2023	Alice H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Segment A will ruin our lifestyle in McKinney. We will no longer be "unique". It ruins so many existing businesses and everyday life for so many residents in its path. It's not right! Segment B does not affect near the number of families or businesses. Choose B or forget this road!</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
34	3/27/2023	Alice Halsor	Email	<p>As a homeowner on Harvest Hill in Ween Creek in McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>📧 Alice Halsor 281-413-3844 Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
35	4/20/2023	Alicia A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to segment A because of the cost, loss of homes &amp; businesses, etc. We recognize that growth has to happen but let's be smart about it and go with Segment B option.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
36	2/6/2023	Alicia Bimson	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
37	3/16/2023	Alison Denne	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
38	3/9/2023	Alison Lewis	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely Alison Lewis McKinney Stonebridge Ranch resident	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
39	3/15/2023	Alison Ritterbusch	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Alison Ritterbusch	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
40	3/14/2023	Allen Carr	Email	<p>I am opposed to Segment A as the current route preferred by TxDOT. Nothing about the selection of Segment A, instead of Segment B, makes any sense. I am a resident of Tucker Hill neighborhood and don't want all that traffic dumped out on to 380 right in front of our entrance. Everyone has personal reasons for not wanting either segment coming through or near their property. Personal reasons aside, I believe TxDOT is not being fiscally responsible with selection of Segment A. By your own estimates, it will cost around 200 million more to build A than B. It will displace 15 functioning businesses whereas B would potentially displace none. There are at least 7 major utility conflicts and B has only 2. Segment A crosses more wetlands with more potential destruction of said wetlands. Your presentation indicated that part of the reason for selecting A, not B, was due to future developments in Segment B (not under construction yet) being impacted. How about the impact on developments already here and under construction! ManeGait was also listed as a reason for selecting A over B, due to public concern. If I understand what I have read and heard, ManeGait should and would not be affected by being in close proximity to the 380 Bypass. I believe TxDOT investigated other similar facilities near such roadways and found no issues. I believe these concerns have been fabricated and promoted by interested parties (Darling/Prosper). Please reconsider what you are proposing and change the preferred route to Segment B. How about saving some tax payer dollars, 15 businesses, and affecting fewer current residents/homeowners. Thank you,</p> <p>Allen Carr 2309 Tremont Blvd McKinney, Tx. Sent from my iPad5</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
41	4/20/2023	Allison R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
42	2/25/2023	Allison Sohmer	Email	<p>Hi there,  I am reaching out to support route D rather than C for the 8 lane highway 380 bypass. My close friend lives in the zone that would be affected by route C and would cut right through her front pasture where she and friends ride their horses, including my horse who lives there as well. I've spent years riding with this friend at her beautiful ranch, it has the most peaceful view and vibe, all which would be destroyed by route C. This friend is such a gift to the community, offering horse riding opportunities to underprivileged kids who desperately need connection and the healing of horses. She also is an avid beekeeper and route C would go right through her bee hives. We all know how important bees are to our ecosystem. Please reconsider this decision and know that it would be a major loss to the community and natural beauty of McKinney. Don't let the city overrun every bit of nature we have left. 🙏 Thank you,  Allison Sohmer  Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. More information about the necessary steps to identify and address community impacts on a TxDOT project can be found at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf</a>.</p>
43	2/27/2023	Alyson Johnson	Email	<p>I am writing to you to let you know that I oppose Segment A as it will be very detrimental to my property and it's value.  NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B  As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.  Regards,  Alyson Johnson  832-317-2156  1400 Roxboro Lane  Mckinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
44	2/17/2023	Alyssa S.	Online	<p>This bypass impacts many more homes than just those you are cutting through. All the neighborhoods that are near 380 would see significant decrease in value due to noise and disturbances from this bypass, Particularly in Prosper. This can't just be about dollars and cents. It needs to be about the people of Prosper who will be negatively impacted. I see a lot more negative than positive from the bypass.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
45	4/20/2023	Amanda B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose construction of Segment A. The cost to all McKinney taxpayers is significant and the damages to Stonebridge Ranch are untold.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
46	3/1/2023	Amanda Batson	Email	<p>NO to A, YES to B</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the use of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>My opposition to the use of Segment A could appear simply as NIMBY (not in my back yard), however, my concerns have only grown with the details published via the US 380 Environmental Impact Study:</p> <p>Costs to Taxpayers – Any way the data are diced, Segment A is more expensive. With the citizens of McKinney on the hook for at least \$120 million – even if/when state/federal funds arrive to reimburse – we are facing extraordinary unplanned expenses. With Segment B construction, the costs to taxpayers will be reduced and shared between McKinney and Prosper residents and potentially other Collin County partners.</p> <p>Property Takings – The numbers of business and residential properties either taken or displaced are strikingly greater in Segment A than Segment B. Such destruction is definitely reduced with construction of Segment B.</p> <p>Human Impact – Construction of Segment A impacts thousands of people not just during years of construction but literally forever as the Segment A traffic ensues. The health, environmental, and safety damages will never be fully known, but what we will realize is unrelenting noise pollution, diminished air quality, and increased arterial traffic through well-established communities. With the undeveloped land available in Segment B, the human impact will be significantly reduced.</p> <p>TxDOT is responsible to current and future Texas citizens. That responsibility includes wise use of all resources for safety and health. The responsible decision for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827 is construction of Segment B in the Blue Alternative.</p> <p>No to Segment A, Yes to Segment B</p> <p>Sincerely,  Amanda Batson  Amanda D. Batson, PhD  ████████████████████  8400 Craftsbury Lane  McKinney, TX 75071  214-842-8667</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
47	3/7/2023	Amanda Batson	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Amanda Batson 8400 Craftsbury Lane McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
48	4/20/2023	Amanda Batson	Email	<p>CWA 404 and Protected Species Dear Mr. Endres, Regarding the TxDOT decision to construct Segment A as part of the US380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827 and as a resident of Stonebridge Ranch and member of the SRCA Board of Directors, I continue my strong opposition to construction of Segment A. The TxDOT selection of Segment A based on the posted Environmental Impact Study apparently did not consider the following: EIS – Appendix N, Water Resources – Section 404, Clean Water Act – Be aware that Stonebridge Ranch has extensive waters and wetlands protected under USACE Section 404. These protected areas include Lake La Cima, its related wetlands, and habitats which are adjacent to the proposed US380 Bypass Segment A. For reference, I am attaching the SRCA Lakes Report which provides an overview of 21 lakes and bodies of water in Stonebridge Ranch. Migratory Bird Treaty Act - EIS – Appendix N, Water Resources – Section 404, Clean Water Act - EIS Figures 8-3, 9-3, 10-3, 11-3, 12-3 – Although these are consistent overlays, the articulated Segment A construction in this area does not reflect the impact on all of the waters flowing in Stonebridge Ranch via section 404 properties. These waters, wetlands, habitats, and species that inhabit these environments are part of an entire eco-system that does not stop at the TxDOT expansion of US380 Bypass. McKinney is located in a migratory path for birds that travel between South America and central/northern North America, twice a year. Heron and egret migrations include birds seeking nesting areas. Stonebridge Ranch waters are chosen by these birds, and once nested, nothing can be done to disperse the birds because they are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. It is unlawful to kill, move, or disturb these birds once they have established a nest. Segment A v Segment B Comparison presents a Concerning Lack of Data-Driven Decision-Making in the selection of Segment A – Using the TxDOT February 16, 2023, Virtual Meeting, Segment Analysis Matrix, the data below were reported. Additionally, a local resident counted upwards of 30 business displacements along Segment A, almost twice the TxDOT count.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Impacts are assessed for the resources present within the proposed ROW.</p> <p>As described in Section 3.10 and Appendix N of the DEIS, TxDOT conducted a delineation of water features (e.g., wetlands, streams, ponds) within the proposed ROW for the Build Alternatives considered. As required under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), wetlands were delineated, on properties where access was granted by the property owner, using the routine method described in the USACE 1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual (1987 Manual; USACE, 1987) and the USACE Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Great Plains Region (2010 Regional Supplement; USACE, 2010). Analyses to determine potential permanent and temporary impacts to wetlands and possible waters of the US were conducted following TxDOT Water Resources guidance. The portion of Segment A along existing US 380 near Stonebridge Ranch minimizes impacts to water features by minimizing the amount of ROW needed from the south side of US 380.</p> <p>In addition, land cover/vegetation and habitats were reviewed and categorized using Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) Ecological Mapping System of Texas (EMST) data (see Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS). As described in Section 3.11.5, construction of the Blue Alternative will comply with applicable provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Texas Parks and Wildlife Code Title 5, Subtitle B, Chapter 64, Birds. It is TxDOT's policy to avoid removal and destruction of active bird nests except through federal or state approved options. Where appropriate and practicable, TxDOT also uses measures to prevent or discourage birds from building nests on man-made structures and schedule maintenance and construction activities outside the typical nesting season. TPWD Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented before, during, and after construction, as appropriate, to avoid/minimize impacts to state-listed species that may also benefit migratory birds.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response																																								
				<p>In every TxDOT category below except one, Segment B is less impactful and costs taxpayers less:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>TxDOT Category</td> <td>Segment A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Segment B</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Major Utility Conflicts</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Residential Displacements</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Business Displacements</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>ROW Required/Cost</td> <td>180 acres/\$248 million</td> </tr> <tr> <td>191 acres/\$153 million</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wetlands total acres</td> <td>1.04 acre</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.46 acre</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rivers/streams total linear ft.</td> <td>5,161 linear feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2,759 linear feet</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Forests/Prairies &amp; Grasslands total acres</td> <td>67 acres/41 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>35 acres/67 acres</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hazardous Materials</td> <td>2 moderate risk/2 high risk</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 sites</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Total Cost</td> <td>\$958 million</td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$766 million</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>I urge you and TxDOT to seriously reconsider and reject the selection of Segment A in the recommended Blue Alternative for US380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,  Amanda Batson  Amanda D. Batson, PhD  ████████████████████  8400 Craftsbury Lane  McKinney, TX 75071  214-842-8667</p>	TxDOT Category	Segment A	Segment B		Major Utility Conflicts	7	2		Residential Displacements	2	5		Business Displacements	15	0		ROW Required/Cost	180 acres/\$248 million	191 acres/\$153 million		Wetlands total acres	1.04 acre	0.46 acre		Rivers/streams total linear ft.	5,161 linear feet	2,759 linear feet		Forests/Prairies & Grasslands total acres	67 acres/41 acres	35 acres/67 acres		Hazardous Materials	2 moderate risk/2 high risk	0 sites		Estimated Total Cost	\$958 million	\$766 million		<p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. TxDOT's Environmental Handbook on Community Impacts, Environmental Justice, Limited English Proficiency, and Title VI Compliance defines displacements as "project-induced impacts to residences, businesses, or other types of facilities (including places of worship, community centers, utility-related facilities, etc.). Displacements can occur as a result of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct impacts to a structure due to construction or right of way acquisition;</li> <li>• Direct impacts to a parcel of land that would make a residence unlivable or a business inoperable;</li> <li>• Loss of parking space to the extent that the operations of a business or service are impeded; or</li> <li>• Loss of access, either due to removal of driveways or service roads used to access a structure.</li> </ul> <p>Based on displacement counts submitted by members of the public as of April 20, 2023, the methodology used in those analyses is not compliant with the state and federal regulations that TxDOT must follow during the NEPA process.</p> <p>The resource categories mentioned are several of the many factors TxDOT considered in selecting a Preferred Alternative. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
TxDOT Category	Segment A																																												
Segment B																																													
Major Utility Conflicts	7																																												
2																																													
Residential Displacements	2																																												
5																																													
Business Displacements	15																																												
0																																													
ROW Required/Cost	180 acres/\$248 million																																												
191 acres/\$153 million																																													
Wetlands total acres	1.04 acre																																												
0.46 acre																																													
Rivers/streams total linear ft.	5,161 linear feet																																												
2,759 linear feet																																													
Forests/Prairies & Grasslands total acres	67 acres/41 acres																																												
35 acres/67 acres																																													
Hazardous Materials	2 moderate risk/2 high risk																																												
0 sites																																													
Estimated Total Cost	\$958 million																																												
\$766 million																																													
49	3/16/2023	Amanda Blankenship	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A  March 16, 2023  As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>																																								

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
50	3/21/2023	Amanda L Shaw-McCaffrey	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres - My name is Amanda Shaw-McCaffrey, I am a Whitley Place resident in Prosper, TX and join my neighbors in the following comments regarding the recent EIS for the 380 bypass plan</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
51	2/16/2023	Amanda Wilson, AICP and Samuel Simmons	Paper comment	<p>US 380 is a critical transportation corridor to the cities within Collin County and the North Central Texas region. This roadway serves as a principal route for local commuters and provides access to several key highways and transportation facilities. The proposed project would provide a new location 8-lane freeway with frontage roads to help manage congestion and improve east-west mobility, connectivity, safety, and air quality. In addition, US 380 is part of a statewide and national transportation system that connects Greenville to the south of Lubbock into New Mexico. This project includes shared-use paths to provide bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. The recommended improvements to this section of US 380 are consistent with Mobility 2045: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas - 2022 Update. Today, the Dallas-Fort Worth area is the fourth-largest metropolitan area in the U.S. with over eight million people. By 2045, the region is projected to have a population of over 11 million. Additional roadway capacity will be needed at numerous strategic locations to meet the growing demand from both passenger vehicles and truck freight movements. Because of the regional importance of this project, the North Central Texas Council of Governments is willing to provide any assistance in the planning, design, and implementation of the project.</p>	<p>Your comment and support of the project is noted.</p>
52	2/7/2023	Amber Block	Email	<p>Good afternoon, I am a resident of McKinney, my address is 2548 FM 2933, McKinney Texas. My husband and I have owned our 11 acre property since 2011. We bought it from the original owners. We have come to learn that despite petitions, environmental studies and the subsequent environmental recommendations, and the significantly higher amount of social impact, txdot has chosen route C over route D for the upcoming 380 bypass. As a resident who lives on FM 2933 this will devastate our ranch and our way of life. We operate a community riding arena that is open and free for all of my neighbors to use. I also have an unofficial horse therapy program which serves at risk youth and those with mental health needs. I serve about 12 people per year. It's small, unofficial and private but my horses make a huge difference to many people. We raise honey bees and harvest hay for our agriculture business. If you were to take a look at route C you will see how this will demolish everything we have built up over the last 13 years. Route C will go right through my outdoor arena, and brush just past my barn. So technically, no buildings would need to be moved. But my</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. You can also reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33 and the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>bees will be gone, my arena will be gone, my hay production will be gone and my barn will hug an eight lane highway. I'm not sure if you are familiar with horses and horse therapy but this will not work. Since the very beginning, we have tried to be as vocal as possible to express our preference of route D, which displaces substantially less people and homes, it has much less environmental impact (as confirmed by the impact studies), and is actually a more direct route to 380. This seems to be to no avail. Given these factors, can you help me understand why txdot would choose route C? I've been told it has to do with spur 399, however it would be very easy to tie route D into the spur. Txdot would just have to curve it a bit. Is it because they want to in effect condemn our land (no one is going to want to live by an 8 lane freeway outside their bedroom window, which is where it would be for our house). If they in effect condemn our land it will be worthless and up for grabs for development. To me, the most obvious answer for why they would choose C is because they want our land for development. My ranch, my neighbors ranches will all made effectively useless, unable to be used what they are intended for. Is it really all about the money? Furthermore, we were told that txdot would be making their final Routes based on environmental impact studies. Not only is Route C opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife, it damages or destroys one of the largest remaining forested areas containing critical wetlands. I'm unfamiliar with any environmental impact study that would recommend to do this. Something that was probably not taken into account in the environmental risk assessment is that fact that many of my neighbors, including myself have developed bee yards over the years. Not only do bees not do well with 8 lane highways, they also don't like being moved. It's highly likely that we will all loose our bees. This in itself would be an environmental catastrophe. I look forward to hearing your response.</p> <p>Sincerely, Amber Block 214-551-3411</p>	<p>residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS. TxDOT's evaluation of potential impacts to ManeGait can be found on page 177 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p> <p>This US 380 EIS project and the Spur 399 Extension project are separate projects with independent utility. Both Segments C and D can be connected to the Spur 399 Preferred Alternative and that is how they were evaluated in the DEIS. The decision for the US 380 Preferred Alternative is not based on the Preferred Alternative for Spur 399.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
53	3/3/2023	Amber Block	Email	<p>Hello, The trouble with the way, txdot has conducted their feasibility study is that they have not considered impacts to homes, unless they are actually needing to remove the home. So the fact that the eight Lane bypass will be 100 feet from my barn does not factor into their feasibility study. They also didn't consider the fact that they will be paving over my riding arena, Honey Bee stand and all of my hay production. Many other families have the same story. It appears Txdot has given little regard to splitting people's working ranches into two sections, dividing acreages by the Highway. Most long standing ranches will loose their agricultural exemption due to the loss of land and ability to produce revenue from said land. A protected wetland area will be gone as well as a large unprotected natural forest. Texas parks and wildlife has officially opposed route C. Txdot has also not factored in a major sewage line that is in the process of being installed along FM 2933. Community resources such as animal rescues, Theraputic riding, a community riding arena and Scouting campground will also be destroyed. Txdot has said they value public feedback and have held two hearings in to hear public feedback. However, in the same breath they have officially told our county commissioners that if they were to express a route preference it would not make a difference to the decision making process. Txdot communicated through the county engineer that their plans are final. Why then do they bother with the public hearings? So many people's lives and livelihoods are uprooted and displaced by route C. Having public hearings and yet not being open to feedback by public representatives is toying with the emotions of the people who live along route C and are doing everything in their power to oppose route C. The most humane and viable alternative is to direct the bypass along route D</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT completed its Feasibility Study in 2020. The current phase of the project is focused on developing the schematic design and environmental documentation. Detailed information can be found in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with the Federal Highway Administration's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p> <p>More information about the necessary steps to identify and address community impacts on a TxDOT project can be found at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf</a>. The project team analyzed the areas around Segments C and D through multiple in-person field visits where Right of Entry (ROE) was granted, use of aerial imagery/maps, and existing databases including Collin County Appraisal District listings.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>where it affects 7 homes and no community resources. Route C affects 29 homes, 7 community resources and 14 businesses. It is time for our representatives to speak up and for txdot to listen. We are the tax payers paying for this road. Our beloved land and animals, our livelihood, our way of life matter. Sincerely, Amber Block</p>	<p>municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled “The Purchase of Right of Way,” and “Relocation Assistance,” are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.</p> <p>Public input is an important factor but it is not the only factor that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS. No final decision regarding an alignment will be made until TxDOT reviews and considers all timely public input.</p> <p>TxDOT, at its sole discretion, will make the final selection of an alignment for the project in the Record of Decision.</p>
54	2/22/2023	Amber Gurney	Online	Pick D, not C. D hardly impacts anyone, whereas C intervenes with a lot of people.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
55	3/16/2023	Amber Livingston	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
56	4/20/2023	Amber P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
57	3/10/2023	Amber Petrik	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Rd to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer business and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of other citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Amber Petrik Homeowner at Ridge & 380 972-679-2666	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
58	2/25/2023	Amber Wax	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Amber Wax	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
59	2/27/2023	Amber Wells	Email	Good Morning, I am writing to voice my support for the Route D bypass, which will not affect nearly as many homes and community resources as Route C. Please consider Route D when choosing the 380 bypass. Thank you, Amber Wells	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.
60	2/6/2023	Amber Yoos	Segment C Petition	Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3 1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative) 2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons: - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</p> <p>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
61	2/27/2023	Amber Yoos	Online	<p>The recommended section C goes directly through my property and I am opposed. The land and home were gifted to me by my grandmother so we currently have no mortgage. Because of this, we are able to provide our son with the opportunity to take private trumpet lessons and boxing classes. If we are forced to move, we will no longer be able to provide for him the life we hoped to, because we will not be able to afford it. We don't want a payout as we're removed from family land. We want to keep our family in our home. Select option D.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services. Reference Section 3.1, as well as figures 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 of the DEIS provide additional information about right-of-way acquisition and displacements.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
62	4/20/2023	Amie M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
63	3/8/2023	Amie Miller	Email	<p>Good morning Stephen,                      Just wanted to send an email letting you know that I live in the Stonebridge community and this 380 expansion/ segment A will absolutely decimate this community. The home values will plummet, the noise level will be off the charts, the business and homes that will be effected will be destroyed, elementary schools with children waking to and from school will be effected, the pollution it creates will cause issues, the list could go on and on. This beautiful community has been around a LONG time!! I'm having a hard time as to why Segment A is even an option when segment B cost less to do and it disrupts less and affects less already established residents and businesses. I also hear Prosper is making a ton of noise about it as well and maybe it's the squeaky wheel gets the oil? McKinney needs to step up and fight for our community. Obviously no one wants this expansion in their backyard but with all of this growth we need it. With that said I say segment B is the best option b/c it cost less from what I'm hearing and it's far less disruptive to this community and surrounding businesses for both McKinney and Prosper                      Thank you -                      Amie Miller                      Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions, including Stonebridge Ranch. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:                      -building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,                      -depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and -providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.
64	1/23/2023	Amina Daar	Email	To whom it may concern, I am a resident of Willow Wood I would like to vote for the proposal of segment D Thank you, Amina M DAAR	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
65	3/15/2023	Amol	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827 Regards, Amol Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S22 Ultra 5G, an AT&T 5G smartphone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
66	3/16/2023	Amy Dearden	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
67	3/8/2023	Amy Limas	Email	Hi Stephen, Here are a few of my outstanding questions I would love to understand more about. On your presentation slide, one of the reasons for selecting A is because it doesn't disrupt ManeGait, however, on the FAQ it specifically states that the study found that ManeGait wouldn't be disrupted with either route. Why would public comments (which were solicited and paid for by Darling) be considered relevant if there are no disruptions? I would also like to know how you arrived at the 70% of comments being in favor of A. We've had so many discussions over the years about duplicate and paid advertising that included the link to the surveys. In addition to finding that	Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. You can also reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33 and the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .  Throughout the Feasibility Study and EIS process, TxDOT received more than 25,000 comments. By far the issue that we heard the most about was the impacts to ManeGait. Even though TxDOT developed an alignment that would not directly require TxDOT to acquire ROW from the ManeGait

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>Darling used 47 empty lots in Tucker Hill to submit comments in favor of A, and hundreds of businesses that weren't actually businesses submitting comments that skewed results. Please tell me how these comments were vetted, how you addressed the false and duplicate comments, and how your team evaluated comments that were paid for through advertising without proper context. In regard to noise air pollution, was there any study done to anticipate construction noise? Seeing as how it could go on for years, shouldn't this have been included, especially if Tucker Hill and Stonebrige residents will be significantly impacted? Lastly, for now, why did all of the districting maps and maps from the RTC show route B as early as 2021? It appeared funding from the RTC was requested for route B originally as well. What changed so late in the decision phase?</p> <p>Thanks, Amy Limas</p>	<p>facility, TxDOT recognizes that the facility is still an important community resource.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>As the Segment Analysis Matrix notes, our analysis includes comments received during the EIS Public Meeting comment period TxDOT held in the Spring of 2022. 94.3% of comments referenced Segments A or B. Of those, 71.2% preferred Segment A to B, 27% preferred Segment B to A, 0.2% were opposed to both Segment A &amp; B, 1.6% supported both Segment A &amp; B. Comments included are from multiple sources including emails and letters send to the TxDOT project manager/project team, online and hard copy comment forms, voicemails, submitted public petitions. Comments were analyzed and categorized based on their support or opposition for each segment: A, B, C, D, E, and F. To prevent duplicates from skewing the results, we removed obvious multiple comments from one person and only counted the comment once to include in the comment analysis. Completely redundant comments were also removed. Again, while public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials.</p> <p>TxDOT performed Traffic Noise Analysis in accordance with FHWA Noise Standard at 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 772 and provided the results in Appendix R: Traffic Noise on page 63.</p> <p>TxDOT has been working collaboratively with NCTCOG to include the US 380 throughout the EIS and NCTCOG 2045 MTP update processes. TxDOT has and continues to provide NCTCOG, as a stakeholder, project updates on the EIS as the project progresses. Prior to an alignment decision from TxDOT, NCTCOG needed to utilize a single US 380 alignment for the purposes of the MTP update and had to make an assumption as to which alignment may move forward in the process. NCTCOG simply used Segment B as the placeholder while working through the MTP update process, with the intention to rectify maps with the final US 380 alignment following TxDOT's decision.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
68	4/20/2023	Amy Limas	Email	<p>To whom it may it concern, While many points you will find below are shared amongst residents, I ask that you address the specific points for each and every comment and question individually, as there are stated differences that apply only to my family and me.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
69	3/16/2023	Amy McAllister	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
70	4/18/2023	Amy Miller	Email	<p>NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Amy Miller</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
71	2/25/2023	Amy Randall	Email	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
72	3/19/2023	Amy Roller	Online	<p>I want to voice my support, again, for Route A. To quote TXDOT's own EIS report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It would require the least amount of now right of way.</li> <li>2) It would not displace any community facilities (Such as ManeGait, an organization of the utmost importance)</li> <li>3) Results in the least number of noise receptors</li> <li>4) Be the least impactful on flood plains and regulatory floodways</li> <li>5 )Minimize the conversion of farmland</li> <li>6) Meet the project Purpose and Need.</li> </ol> <p>Additionally, Prosper has continued to develop as a master planned community with the idea that US380 would be a freeway. Changing the route to cut through a significant portion of Prosper would disproportionately affect the Town of Prosper's commercial real estate and new developments which support its tax base. This would in turn have other down stream effects on Town parks, schools, students, teachers, and residents. I implore you to make a final decision regarding this bypass and stick with the A route as recommended by TXDOT's own EIS study.</p>	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.
73	2/24/2023	Amy Teague	Online	<p>Preferred route: D please</p> <p>Multiple neighboring farms and family homes would be displaced with route C. Very tranquil and beautiful rolling lands. Sad to see multigenerational properties affected. Many have farm animals, awesome trees and wildlife. Bicyclists and motorcycle enthusiasts enjoy peaceful outings along CR 338. A neighbor rescues horses on their land. Preserving this area would be worth it. We own a wedding venue with outdoor spaces used for ceremonies &amp; entertaining. Noise and traffic from the bypass would certainly impact our family business. Thank you for considering Route D over route C :)</p> <p>-Amy Teague</p>	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
74	2/27/2023	Amy Thompson	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,                      I am writing to express my strong preference for Segment D for the US380 Bypass targeted for NE McKinney.                      I am a resident of Collin County and live in Allen, but my in-laws live in McKinney and are one of the at least 29 private residences that will be directly impacted if Segment C is chosen. Segment C would result in a 6 lane highway 200 feet from their house. Their land is a working farm, with cattle and horses, hay and pecan harvesting, and is a frequent gathering spot for our family, including my 3 boys. I know it's easy to look at the numbers and see just that - numbers. But their land is their home - it is a peaceful and beautiful retreat, which will be completely ruined if Segment C is chosen. Based on everything I have seen and read, Segment D is by far the logical choice for the bypass, as it will have significantly less impact on residences and businesses. I urge you to consider the following points as this decision is reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Segment C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses and community resources:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Segment D will only impact 7 private residences, while Segment C will impact 29 private residences.</li> <li>o Segment D will only impact 4 businesses, while Segment C will impact 15 businesses.</li> <li>o Segment D will impact 0 community resources, while Segment C will impact 7 community resources.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Segment C would divide residential and farming/ranching communities.</li> <li>• Segment C would severely damage one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County.</li> <li>• Segment C would destroy 71% more acres of forests and woodlands, and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>• Segment C would disturb wetlands and suitable habitats for threatened species, and wildlife including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory birds and frogs.</li> <li>• Segment C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>• Segment C would have worse traffic performance, including lower traffic capacity, longer travel times, slower travel speeds and more elevation changes.</li> </ul> <p>Segment D is clearly the best option. I question why C is even being considered given all of the above. Please do the right and logical thing, and support Segment D. Thank you,                      Amy Thompson</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
75	2/6/2023	Amy/Chad Teague	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
76	3/16/2023	Ana Brown	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
77	4/20/2023	Andrea C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A, YES TO SEGMENT B or NO BUILD.....	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B and the No-Build Alternative is noted.
78	4/20/2023	Andrea D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A, YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
79	4/17/2023	Andrea Davila	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Andrea Davila Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
80	4/20/2023	Andrea E	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
81	3/14/2023	Andrea Erter	Email	<p>Hello,                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,                      Andrea Erter</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
82	3/6/2023	Andrea Vega	Email	<p>This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.                      * C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County.                      * C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.                      * C disturbs the wetlands that serve as a refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.                      * C eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.                      * C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D).                      * C divides residential and farming/ranching communities.                      * C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources.                      * C has worse traffic performance (lower traffic capacity, slower travel speeds, and more elevation changes).                      Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway.</p> <p>The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.
83	2/25/2023	Andrew B	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
84	4/20/2023	Andrew B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
85	4/20/2023	Andrew D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
86	3/16/2023	Andrew Martin	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Andrew Martin 1512 Canyon Wren Dr Mckinney	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
87	3/20/2023	Andrew McCaffrey	Online	My name is Andrew McCaffrey, I join the comments provided by some of my neighbors in Whitley Place by providing the following comment:  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
88	2/16/2023	Andrew Sisson	Online	As a business owner and resident impacted by the bypass I strongly disagree with the 'C' option for Coit road to FM 1827. Option 'D' is preferred.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
89	4/20/2023	Andy B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
90	3/8/2023	Andy Baragona	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
91	2/6/2023	Andy Fisher	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives</li> <li>Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
92	2/21/2023	Andy Franco	Online	Alternative A is the best option in lieu of just widening 380 from 75 to west side of Town of Prosper. Least residential and commercial disruption to Town of Prosper. No impact on Main Gait. KEEP 380 on 380!!!!	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
93	2/17/2023	Andy Sanders	Online	I oppose C due to the effect of the number of residences and businesses. Also, the amount of damage to the forest and woodlands. I support the Texas Parks and Wildlife and they are opposed C.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. It outlines that for an EIS project, TxDOT is supposed to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things that TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
94	3/10/2023	Angee Webb	Email (1) Online (1)	<p>Hello, I am a resident of Tucker Hill, live on Grassmere, and back up to the land that the bypass will encroach on. I have recently found out it may be pushed even closer to me to avoid the construction that Billingsley is about to start. I am a single mom and my home is the biggest investment I have. I am staying here forever. Tucker Hill is magical and has been a safe haven for me and my son. This will not only ruin our paradise but also affect my real estate value. I'm begging you all to reconsider this plan. 🙏 🙏</p> <p>Thank you, Angee Webb 2304 Grassmere Lane Mckinney</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The previous design was approximately 815 feet from the address you provided. With the design shift, it is approximately 795 feet away from the address provided.
95	4/20/2023	Angee Webb	Email	<p>To whom it may concern: I am a resident in Tucker Hill live at 2304 Grassmere Lane. I have a 10 year old son and am extremely concerned with the choice of segment A vs. B for numerous reasons. Thank you for your time and consideration with my concerns below.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
96	4/20/2023	Angel V	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am here supporting the NO to Segment A and YES for Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
97	4/20/2023	Angela L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
98	3/24/2023	Angela Lamb	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Angela Lamb Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
99	3/24/2023	Angela Moss	Online	<p>Mr. Endres,                      Writing to support the TxDOT recommendation of the 380 bypass being placed in McKinney, east of Prosper city limits. As noted in TxDOT's own EIS report, this placement is advantageous for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires the least amount of right of way</li> <li>2. Would not displace any community facilities. (Numerous residential and commercial facilities that are already present or in construction would be negatively impacted if bypass cut through Prosper. This disproportionately impacts Prosper and our potential tax basis given that Prosper is of significantly diminished size compared to McKinney, who can absorb the tax impacts much easier.)</li> <li>3. Result in the least number of noise receptors</li> <li>4. Be least impactful on flood plains.</li> <li>5. Meet the project Purpose and Need.</li> </ol> <p>Please make a final decision to keep bypass in McKinney. Do not let political pressure (Keith Self, allegedly) sway your decision to benefit a handful while negatively impacting tens of thousands. Thank you.</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
100	2/6/2023	Angelina Lozano	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
101	3/14/2023	Angie Ahrens	Email	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I have many concerns about the area between Ridge and Stonebridge being used as a merging point for the 380 bypass and University. I have reviewed the slides and info presented by TXDOT at length. I see that the TxDOT existing option, Segment B, will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, be more environmentally friendly and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. Another concern is the number of student or young drivers who use that stretch of road to get to high school. I foresee more traffic accidents than current due to merging, turning and speed changes in the area. Loss of life is obviously a huge concern in traffic accidents on highways and must be considered. Segment B removes the extra risk caused by changing traffic patterns. Given the evidence presented thus far, I don't see a good reason to consider Segment A as an option. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Sincerely, Angie Ahrens Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>
102	4/20/2023	Ann C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am not in favor of Segment A. Please implement Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
103	3/8/2023	Ann Carrell	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Thank you, Ann Carrell</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
104	4/20/2023	Ann D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose Segment A because of much higher cost, loss of more businesses and homes, and more disruption to home owners and existing businesses.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
105	3/12/2023	Ann Lunsford	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
106	2/25/2023	Ann Miller	Online	Option B is less expensive and safer than Option A. TxDOT is being negligent and wasteful should you proceed with the current preferred alternative. The brown alternative of B+E+C is the better option in terms of safety, costs, and impact to existing businesses and residential property values.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of the Brown Alternative is noted.
107	3/15/2023	Ann Olsen	Email	Hello, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Staying with Option will negatively impact existing and future businesses (that drive revenue to the County and State), housing (also drives significant tax revenue) and families (many many many will leave the City they have come to love). Sincerely, Ann Olsen 1200 Peacham Court McKinney TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
108	3/16/2023	Anna Block	Email	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodland and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable.</p> <p>Sincerely, Anna Block</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
109	4/20/2023	Anna C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A, YES TO SEGMENT B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
110	4/20/2023	Anne A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
111	2/16/2023	Anne Marie Hanson	Paper form	I am a long time resident of McKinney and am deeply against prop C for changing the roads. It will affect a horse facility where I board and many residences and other businesses. This change will all but destroy the peaceful atmosphere many of us enjoy at Tara Royal Equestrian Center. I am in favor of option D.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
112	4/20/2023	Annette P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
113	2/6/2023	April / Gary Gibson	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
114	2/23/2023	April Rice	Online	<p>"I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
115	2/17/2023	April Williams	Email	I strongly object to route C it make zero sense to distrust that many homes when Route D does not. Even looking at the map the proposed Route C makes zero sense to me. April Williams	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
116	2/16/2023	Ariana N	Online	I live in the Reserve near Coit and Westridge. I really don't understand why this plan is dumping (a) onto Coit and 380. This area is going to cause gridlock at this intersection. An intersection that is already very busy for the businesses, homes and schools in this area. Why would this line not be carried through Prosper and exit out onto Preston? I believe that was the original plan. Point being that it will cause a hardship to the folks including myself and my family to have this line dump out into our main exit from our neighborhoods and schools up here. I oppose this part of the plan.	Your comment and opposition to the project is noted. It is important to note that TxDOT is conducting another project to the west of the US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 project. TxDOT is developing the schematic design and environmental documentation for a potential freeway along US 380 from Teel Parkway/Championship Dr to west of Lakewood Dr. More information about the project is posted at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri</a> .
117	4/20/2023	Arin H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A. YES to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
118	4/19/2023	Arnab Paul	Email	<p>Dear Stephen,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to TxDOT's plans to acquire my commercial property on the NEQ of US Highway 380 and Walnut Grove Road in McKinney. As per our lease contract, we are about to begin construction of a multi-tenant building for my tenants, and the proposed acquisition will significantly disrupt their lives, as well as those of countless small businesses and their employees across Texas. Relocating businesses, customers, and employees will cause considerable inconvenience, not to mention the fact that the acquisition of land for the bypass will undermine the property rights of local landowners. Additionally, I am concerned that the proposed compensation for the acquisition of these properties is much lower than their actual worth, leading to financial hardship for many business owners, including myself. In contrast, I believe that the city of McKinney's resolution for an alternative route (Segment B) is a much better option. Therefore, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ROW bypass (Segment A) and find alternative solutions that do not require the acquisition of land. Our community deserves better, and it is crucial that we work together to find a solution that benefits all stakeholders. Finally, I want to emphasize that I strongly oppose the acquisition of my property, as it will cause significant hardship for my family. Thank you for your time and consideration. Best regards,</p> <p>Arnab Paul</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>All alternatives and segments studied would require TxDOT to acquire property.</p> <p>All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser. If the appraisal process indicates that the remaining property will have a lesser value after the project is constructed, the property owner will be offered an amount for damages to be included in the total offer made by TxDOT.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
119	4/20/2023	Arthur N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Current design of Segment A reduces emergency vehicle access to Tucker Hill and increases noise level. For comparison check the noise level of Central Expressway and Southwestern Blvd in Dallas.	<p>Your comment is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
120	3/9/2023 3/10/2023	Ash Hack	Email (2)	<p>Thank you, my children attend McClure elementary school, and there are many concerns with the current proposal. Stephen, please hear us out...</p> <p>Comment: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Ash Hack 469-410-2635</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
121	3/16/2023	Ashley Haydel	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
122	3/24/2023	Ashley Holley	Email	<p>US 380 Bypass NE McKinney                      Oppose C (Catastrophe) and Support D (Decent)                      Reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>• C disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• C eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/ threatened species.</li> <li>• C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D).</li> <li>• C affects and displaces 383% more homes (29 vs. 6), 300% more businesses (16 vs. 4), and more community resources.</li> <li>• Most importantly, this will ruin our family home, our family property where we have multiple rescue horses, cows, donkeys, chickens, dogs, and cats. The property that my kids get to grow up spending time with their grandparents. All the memories we've made and want to continue making. This is the property where we spend EVERY holiday together with the whole family. It's not right that you can take that from us. How much blood, sweat, and tears went into creating and building our family home, taking care of all these animals. Option D just makes the most sense. Less families will be destroyed by this plan. Thank you for taking the time to read this, God bless.                      -Ashley                      Sent from my iPhone</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
123	3/29/2023	Ashley Pepkin	Online	I would prefer that 380 stay on 380 and the Outer Loop project be expedited to alleviate traffic on 380, but if that is not possible then I would support the Blue (A-E-C) route and keep this road out of Prosper.	<p>Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.</p>
124	2/16/2023	Ashley Swim	Paper form	Our two kids are growing up on this property where my husband and I get the privilege to live. This would greatly affect our family! Our 2 kids 2 and 1 wouldn't get to live with their grandparents anymore. This land is where we have all the holidays and get together. This land that my father-in law works so hard to keep nice and clean so everyone can enjoy it. Also, the horses, cows, donkeys that we rescued. Please don't put this road through this property!	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.
125	3/28/2023	Ashok Ramasamy	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Ashok Ramasamy	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
126	3/15/2023	Athena Thomas	Email	Hello, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Athena Thomas	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
127	3/7/2023	Audlayne	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
128	3/7/2023	Audlayne	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
129	4/3/2023	Ava Brown	Written Comment Form	You may not live in SBR but if you did would YOU want this done to your community? Would you agree to the option that's more expensive? Would you want your quiet community to have to have a 12 lane freeway? Please think about how this will affect thousands of families and businesses. This plan is going to discourage families from moving here. Ava Brown	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
130	2/6/2023	Avalon Legacy Ranch	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
131	1/26/2023	B.T.	Online	Stop trying to build a bypass which both towns and citizens do NOT want!	Your comment and opposition to the project is noted. Results of public and stakeholder input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
132	4/20/2023	Bailey P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
133	2/25/2023	Barbara Andrews	Email	Dear Mr. Endres: As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Barbara Andrews	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
134	3/16/2023	Barbara Barnett	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
135	2/17/2023	Barbara Crouch	Online	TxDOT has it right....no McKinney by-pass through Prosper. For years, the town has said no and I presume people understand that no-means-no. So, No McKinney by-pass through Prosper means "NO MCKINNEY BY PASS THROUGH PROSPER". Thank you for siding with TxDot. They have it right.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
136	4/19/2023	Barbara Dailey	Email	I oppose segment A - it costs more money and will displace more businesses and established homes. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
137	3/16/2023	Barbara Geiger	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
138	3/29/2023	Barbara Glass	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Barbara Glass</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
139	3/6/2023	Barbara Holden	Email	<p>Dear Stephen,                      C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County.                      C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.                      C disturbs the wetlands that serve as a refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.                      C eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.                      C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D).                      C divides residential and farming/ranching communities.                      C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources.                      C has worse traffic performance (lower traffic capacity, slower travel speeds, and more elevation changes).                      Please oppose Segment C and make Segment D the preferred route.                      Signed,                      A very concerned resident,                      Barbara Holden</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
140	3/16/2023	Barbara J. Copeland	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
141	2/6/2023	Barbara Petty	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
142	3/7/2023	Barbara Sandt	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
143	4/20/2023	Barbara Sano	Email	April 20, 2023 To Whom It May Concern: As a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 MILLION more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of political maneuvering, campaigning, and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait that has swayed TXDOT's position, and I condemn these actions as unethical and improper. The preferred segment should be chosen based on the facts and what the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) requires. Per CEQ (2021), decisions on an alignment must be based on what is practical and feasible from a technical and economic standpoint, RATHER THAN WHAT IS DESIRABLE FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE AGENCY (TXDOT).  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
144	4/20/2023	Barbara W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
145	4/6/2023	Barnalee Paul	Email	<p>Dear Stephen,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to the TxDOT plans to acquire my commercial property that is located on NEC of US Highway 380 and Walnut Grove Road, McKinney. We're about to start the construction to build a multi-tenant building that must be delivered to my tenants as per lease contract. The TxDOT plan will disrupt the lives of countless small businesses and their employees in the state of Texas. Not only will these businesses have to relocate, but also their customers and employees will be impacted to some degree, as well. Furthermore, the value of these properties is typically much lower than their actual worth, which means that the businesses will not receive a fair compensation for the property acquired. This could lead to financial hardship for many business owners as well as my property. I believe the city of McKinney has passed the resolution alternative route (Segment B) which will be the best option in my opinion. I urge TxDOT to reconsider their plans to acquire business properties for their projects. I believe there are other ways (Segment B) to achieve the same or better goals without negatively impacting the livelihoods of so many Texans. I strongly oppose acquiring my property because it will lead to hardship to my family. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely</p> <p>Barnalee Paul 214-9863967 Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.</p>
146	3/14/2023	Barry and Gale Rhoads	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Seems like politics has raised its ugly head as usual. Appears the City of McKinney is most affected from this project and has proven the case for B instead of Segment A. Less costly and least impact on businesses and residential. I KNOW YOU CAN SEE THAT!! BY THE WAY, thanks for destroying our CVS on ridge for a gravel dump or whatever! Smooth move Steve! SO DISGUSTED!</p> <p>Sincerely, Barry and Gale Rhoads Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other build alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
147	4/20/2023	Barry B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	B is the only real bypass!!!	Your comment is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
148	4/20/2023	Barry F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A Yes to segment. B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
149	4/20/2023	Barry R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Why is the city McKinney affected the most? Something is rotten in Denmark!	Your comment is noted.
150	3/15/2023	Bdn Dogs	Email	<p>Subject: Change 380 bypass from route C to D</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project.</p> <p>Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodland and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</p> <p>Personally, Route C will destroy an area that I have known and loved as a long-time resident of Collin County. If Route C is imposed, we will lose access to community riding arenas, wooded trails, and outdoor pursuits. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. This US 380 EIS project and the Spur 399 Extension project are separate projects with independent utility. Both Segments C and D can be connected to the Spur 399 Preferred Alternative and that is how they were evaluated in the DEIS. The decision for the US 380 Preferred Alternative is not based on the Preferred Alternative for Spur 399.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
151	2/19/2023	Becky Hilton	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,                      I am writing to strongly urge you to choose Option D as the plan for the 380 Bypass/Spur 399 Extension. Too many of our small, invaluable Texas ranches would be destroyed by Option C. I know that Texas continues to grow by leaps and bounds and additional roadways are inevitable, but if we do not preserve these iconic areas and ranches when we can, very soon Texas will be unrecognizable. Option C would be a devastating choice given its negative impact to the environment, residents and future development potential. Please do all you can to protect Texas and this rural part of McKinney! Thank you,                      Becky Hilton</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
152	3/31/2023	Becky Kron	Email (2)	<p>Here is why:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>2. Destroy 71% more acres of forests and woodlands</li> <li>3. Destroys 141% more acres of grassland and prairie</li> <li>4. Disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>5. Eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.</li> <li>6. Affects and displaces 383% more of homes ( 29 versus 6)</li> <li>7. Affects and displaces 300% more businesses ( 16 versus 4)</li> <li>8. Affects and displaces more community resources</li> <li>9. Strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife</li> </ol> <p>Please OPPOSE 380 BYPASS ROUTE C! Clearly, ROUTE C SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED,</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
153	2/20/2023	Becky Roper	Email	<p>Hello Stephen, I am writing about my experiences at Amber Block's property at 2548 FM 2933 and the affect of loosing that to route C. I am Amber's horse trainer and have ridden multiple horses and given lessons on her property. Many of my clients have come over for trail rides and arena work. We have had parties, bonfires, pool parties, so many gatherings. This would be catastrophic to loose this home and land. The contribution she has provided for my business has been invaluable. Thank you for reading this email. Becky Roper USEA ECP Certified Instructor, Trainer, and Coach in Area 5</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
154	4/20/2023	Ben H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option A is going to disrupt the lives of many more people than Option B. Option A cost \$100 million if tax payer money. How have we become so irresponsible with public funds? Option B is cheaper.....Prosper needs to understand that.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p>The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
155	3/10/2023	Ben Hart	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely concerned Stonebridge Ranch Resident, Ben Hart Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
156	3/15/2023	Ben Portis	Email	Good Afternoon Mr. Stephen Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Ben Portis	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
157	3/19/2023	Ben Pruett	Email	Stephen Endres,  Attached are my comments on the Draft Environmental Statement dated January 02, 2023. Please see that my comments are included in the public comments and properly considered by TxDOT and consultants assigned to the project.  Please feel free to contact me if you, or others working on the project, have any questions or require further information.  Regards,  Ben Pruett 714.305.0391  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
158	3/14/2023	Benita Elias	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Benita Elias	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
159	1/15/2023	Benjamin Cable	Online	I stand in strong opposition to Segment B - Brown and Gold plans. We are moving to Prosper this March.	Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which does not include Segment B.
160	1/31/2023	Benjamin Smith	Online	Homeowners have made it very clear there is no desire to expand 380 and have a bypass. As a town and community we have been very clear about our opposition. to the bypass. Providing another option does nothing more than infuriate the citizens. Please look for other alternatives further north for a limited access road. Thank you!	Your comment and opposition to the project is noted. Results of public input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix that can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .  It is important to note that there are also similar impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
161	4/20/2023	Bentley D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes b	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
162	3/16/2023	Berle Barnett	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
163	2/21/2023	Bernard J. Noel	Email	<p>Sir,  As a resident of Stonebridge, in McKinney, TX, I am writing to you today to express my total opposition to have the new 308 "by pass" use segment "A": Building a new freeway on segment "A" is a non-sense, it will cost more than using segment "B", and it will affect thousands of residents, versus one wealthy lady with horses who might have to relocate if segment "B" is chosen! You can go with B-E-D or B-E-C, but not F (total non-sense!) nor A-E-D or A-E-C (also total non-sense!!!!) Thank you for your common sense and cooperation, Sir, and for NOT choosing segment "A".</p> <p>V/r,  Bernard Noel  6504 Alderbrook Place  McKinney, TX 75071</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
164	3/8/2023	Bernard J. Noel	Email	<p>Sir:  As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,  Bernard J. Noel  Investigator  U.S. Dept. of Labor- Occupational Safety &amp; Health Administration (OSHA)  Office of the Whistleblower Protection Program  525 South Griffin St., Suite 602  Dallas, Texas 75202  Office: 972-850-4162  Cell: 405-850-7910  Email: [REDACTED]</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
165	4/20/2023	Bernard N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A!!!!!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
166	4/3/2023	Bernie Brown	Written Comment Form	<p>To: TXDOT                      Re: 380 ByPass, McKinney, TX                      As an interested citizen and homeowner in McKinney, TX, I strongly oppose option A and encourage TXDOT to select the less expensive option B. Option A is far more expensive and intrusive - it only makes sense to go with option B - why choose A? Thank you,                      Bernie Brown</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>
167	3/16/2023	Bernie Brown	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TXDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TXDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
168	3/16/2023	Bernie Brown	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TXDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TXDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
169	3/7/2023	Beth Cromwell	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
170	2/17/2023	Beth Giles	Email	Stephen, I oppose the proposed Route C for the 380 Bypass as it affects more homes than the proposed D. Many community resources and homes would be disrupted with the proposed route C rather than the Route D which is mostly flood plains and fewer homes. Thank you for your consideration.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).
171	3/29/2023	Beth Hall	Email	Hi Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Beth Hall Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
172	4/20/2023	Betty B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I would love it to bypass all of McKinney. Bring a senior is a challenge in McKinney due to traffic!	Your comment is noted.
173	4/20/2023	Betty P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A. YES TO B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
174	4/17/2023	Betty Prindle	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
175	2/6/2023	Beverly Beauchamp	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
176	2/27/2023	Beverly Beauchamp	Email	<p>Please support Plan D for the 380 bypass. Plan C destroys much more forest and wetlands and is opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Beverly Beauchamp McKinney Tx 75071 Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
177	2/6/2023	Bhargav / Rachana Patel	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship,</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					community centers, post office, library, etc.).  The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.  Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.
178	3/16/2023	Bianca Urioste	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
179	3/21/2023	Bill Terrell	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, I agree with the Segment A routing of the TxDot preferred alignment of the 380 Bypass. Thanks, Bill Terrell 8564 CR 858 McKinney, TX 75071	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.
180	3/28/2023	Blake Hall	Email	Hi Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Blake Hall (214) 793-3051 [REDACTED]	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
181	3/29/2023	Blake Hunter	Online	I would prefer that 380 stay on 380 and the Outer Loop project be expedited to alleviate traffic on 380, but if that is not possible then I would support the Blue (A-E-C) route and keep this road out of Prosper.	<p>Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.</p>
182	4/20/2023	Bo L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
183	3/17/2023	Bob Andrzejewski	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Bob Andrzejewski 17-year McKinney resident	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
184	3/15/2023	Bob Benson	Email	Stephen, As a concerned citizen of the area of discussion, I am completely "perplexed" as to this extension...an EIS has been completed, a DEIS has been created and according to process and protocols, as well as, precedence set in almost all "like projects", this one...for some reason continues. I applaud you and all that have diligently worked on this, and I trust that ALL aspects considered have shown proof that the proper route for the Bypass, just East of Tucker Hill will prevail. As has been studied and considered, the Parks and Recreation areas, School and Academic structures, amenities for the Disabled, existing housing for families and seniors, wildlife...all of the above have been "saved" based on the current position. SEGMENT A is truly the proper path... Thank you, Bob Benson	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.
185	3/8/2023	Bob Botsford	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the Bypass of US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand that TXDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to the 36,000 residents of Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Bob Botsford 513 Creekside Dr. McKinney, TX 75071 Cell 972-365-1955	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
186	3/13/2023	Bob Clough	Email	Good morning, I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to assess the impact and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill, as well as, other neighborhoods and businesses affected by Segment A. Robert Clough 7312 Easley Dr McKinney, TX 75071 Bob	This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.  Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
187	2/6/2023	Bob Qualls / Debbie Bradshaw	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
188	2/16/2023	Bob Seei	Paper form	Thank you for listening to most everyone!	Your comment is noted.
189	4/4/2023	Bob Thomas	Email	<p>Stephen, A few questions regarding the proposed schematics of the 380 bypass and how it affects our property located at the Northwest corner of Hwy 380 and FM 1827:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you confirm the location of our property on the 380 flyover:</li> <li>2. Can you provide any illustrations reflecting where proposed street lights or stoplights will be located around our property?</li> <li>3. What access will be allowed to our property from 380 and FM 1827?</li> <li>4. Can you provide details of the proposed drainage shown on our property below:</li> </ol> <p>Thank you, Bob Thomas 469-879-0405</p>	<p>The proposed right-of-way shown on the proposed interim design change on the FM 1827/proposed US 380 interchange board is the right-of-way TxDOT will be clearing as part of the FEIS.</p> <p>The need for high mast or safety lighting along the freeway will be decided during the next stage of project development which is final design. A traffic signal warrant study will also be performed to evaluate if signalized intersections are needed at the intersections of the proposed US 380 frontage roads and existing US 380.</p> <p>TxDOT is currently showing a potential driveway location that could access University on the south side of the property and onto the new frontage road, but other points of access can be obtained by property owner requests through the driveway permitting process to the TxDOT Collin County Area Office.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing culverts on TxDOT proposed ROW at the southeast corner just outside the property limits at University. Potential access locations and proposed drainage are indicated on the schematic roll plots. The Schematic Viewing Guide provides guidance on how to read the roll plots.</p>
190	4/20/2023	Bob Y	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is the only one that makes sense. We need to save taxpayer money and keep this road away from our existing neighborhoods and businesses.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
191	3/21/2023	Bobbi Hoenigman	Email	<p>Strongly urging TXDOT to pick Segment D for the 380 Bypass at mckinney.....Segment c is too harmful to too many residents.</p> <p>Bobbi Hoenigman MIniEncounters Mini Therapy Horses P.O. Box 342 Melissa TX 75454 214-707-2734 cell</p>	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
192	4/20/2023	Bogdan D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Plan B is simply the most logical choice. I oppose Segment A.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
193	2/6/2023	Bonnie Rubarts	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
194	3/18/2023	Brad Davis	Online	<p>I am confused by how this winding loop around McKinney improves mobility. US 380 is not a major highway, it has a history of being a highway, but its just a city street now. You've done a poor job of explaining the problem you are trying to solve. The road has a lot of cars, but that is not because it needs to be rerouted, its because its the only E/W option. Collin County Outer loop (just 5 miles north of your proposal), would be a better use of public funds. Extending Wilmeth and Bloomdale to Prosper would ease 380 traffic. Building Laud Howell as a option between the tollway and 75 would be a better use of public funds. There are many other options to help alleviate US380 and improve mobility in and around McKinney. The problem with 380 in McKinney is that there is no other route from East Collin County to West Collin County. This proposal does not solve that problem, look at diverting funds to other already planned E/W projects to provide more options for drivers.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>
195	3/6/2023	Brad Johnson	Online	<p>supporting "plan B"                      It costs \$98.8 million less and has a lesser impact to citizens.                      Any support for the other plan is a non starter.                      Why waste \$100 million when plan B is the obvious choice??</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
196	3/30/2023	Brad Shaw	Email	<p>Senator Paxton, Representative Leach, and Mr. Endres:                      I oppose Segment C and support Segment D for several reasons. One is the lower environmental impact. I am very concerned about damaging the forest and wetlands. Segment C has a good number of threatened species living in it. One of the species is the alligator turtle. It is a very unique looking turtle and I don't want this habitat destroyed. When I compare Segment C and Segment D, it's very obvious that there's so many more homes and businesses affected on Segment C. There are small communities along C that would become divided. Farms and ranches would be cut in half. There's horse rescue, llama rescue, bee keeping and high school scholarships, equestrian center, wedding venue, therapeutic riding, blacksmith shop, Boy Scout camp, Heron rookery, river otters, Air B&amp;B, horse recuperation barn, running cattle, hay production, horse ranches, and a pecan farm, to name a few of the businesses and community services that will be gone. Additionally, the way the decision to move from Segment D to Segment C was a bit sketchy and last minute. That deserves an investigation into who influenced that last minute, uncommunicated change. Please help us by opposing Segment C and choosing the more favorable route for the environment and for business, Segment D. Thank you,                      Brad Shaw</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. It is important to note that TxDOT must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and uses the TxDOT environmental compliance process for state and local projects. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with FHWA NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.
197	2/25/2023	Braden Morehead	Email	Good morning Stephen, I wanted to reach out and voice my opinion as a homeowner that I believe we should vote NO to Segment A, and YES to Segment B. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks, Braden Morehead	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
198	4/20/2023	Bradley M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A and Yes to Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
199	2/28/2023	Bradley Tidwell	Online	I don't understand how the final path for the 380 bypass/highway would help the current situation of traffic on the current 380. Looking at all the alternatives, it seems that the golden alternative would make the most sense. This alternative would cause less disruptions with current traffic flow. It also would provide a connection directly to the McKinney Airport. which to my understanding the plan for that airport is to make it bigger and provide airline flights out of McKinney. I also have a personal objection to route C do to it would affect the farm/horse ranch that is helping my daughters mental state with private horse ride therapy. Which makes route D more favored than C. Again, D would provide a direct connection to the McKinney Airport regardless of the other routes chosen. I hope that my voice will be heard and my arguments taking in the consideration of the final plan. Best regards, Brad Tidwell	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. More detailed information can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS posted at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
200	2/6/2023	Brandi Carroll	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
201	3/14/2023	Brandi Gomez	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Brandi Gomez	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
202	4/20/2023	Brandi M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A – yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
203	2/5/2023	Brandi Martin	Online	I commute to Oklahoma every single day for work and have to drive on 380 from I35 to McKinney and it is HORRIBLE, however, in no way shape or form am I willing to support this going through my community or neighborhood. 380 in McKinney is nothing compared to the stop and go traffic from Prosper toward Denton. I agree we do need an alternate route, but not where this is proposed. This build needs to have been curved out north prior to Coit– this location solves nothing. Please DO NOT build this monstrosity! This will be a horrible for McKinney neighborhoods, new drivers, students trying to get to the appropriate school zones, noise...etc. I would rather NOT BUILD than to have this destroy McKinney. People by the masses (especially in Stonebridge) will move to other towns if this happens.	Your comment and opposition to the project is noted. There are also similar impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.  A separate feasibility study was conducted for US 380 in Denton County. More information can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-denton-county-feasibility-study">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-denton-county-feasibility-study</a> . The schematic design and environmental review are still a few years from beginning.
204	3/14/2023	Brandi Martin	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Brandi Martin Sent from iPhone Sent from iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
205	2/6/2023	Brandon / Cindy Webster	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
206	3/7/2023	Brandon and Stacy Head	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Brandon and Stacy Head	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
207	3/24/2023	Brandon Harmon	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Brandon Harmon La Cima Estates home owner Regards, Brandon	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
208	4/20/2023	Brandon R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please do the right thing. Route A DECREASES mobility. Why on earth would we do that?!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.  The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
209	3/15/2023	Brandon Rojas	Online	It's incredibly disappointing that TxDOT would choose section A over B. It makes no sense!! 3 homes and a non profit should not get in the way of literally millions of travelers and the commute of millions of people in our community. Please reconsider route B. This is the best route for the entire county, not .001% of the population.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
210	3/26/2023	Brandon Rojas	Email	<p>Hello Stephen,            When this bypass was presented to us, Segment B affected the least amount of businesses, homes, the environment, reduced travel time, and most of all was the most cost effective. As a business owner in Mckinney I'm very disappointed that Segment A was chosen. This route is slower, will cost our city more, and ultimately affect our environment more than moving a business. Please reconsider all of the impacted homes and build Segment B. I appreciate your time! Sincerely,            [REDACTED]            M: 469-706-7812   P: 214-901-2311            3747 Grace Ranch Trl.            McKinney, TX 75071</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
211	4/20/2023	Brenda D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please keep some of this madness away from the more established neighborhoods.	Your comment is noted.
212	4/20/2023	Brenda Freund	Email	<p>Hello Sir,            My name is Brenda Freund and I moved into Tucker Hill in 2022. My son and his family, Graham and Jackie Weedon, also live here in Tucker Hill and have also written to you. As the first homeowner of a new construction home, I thought it important to be clear that at no time in the sale, construction, or closing did the possibility of a bypass come up. I'm deeply concerned because I live in the northeast corner of Tucker Hill which stands to lose the beautiful greenbelt ecosystem that separates Tucker Hill from Auburn Hills. I am also sharing the letter that my son and his wife sent you. I echo their comments, and stand behind the amazingly detailed and thoughtful letter that our neighbors have researched and written. With all the evidence that Segment B is the obvious superior choice, it begs the question what or who is influencing the decision to choose the more expensive and impactful Segment A. We're confident that if the authorities do their proper research and validation of all the factors, the only true, confident choice is Segment B. Thank you,            Brenda Freund            2713 Majestic Avenue            Mckinney, Tx 75071            337-485-9709</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
213	3/30/2023	Brendan Bogenschutz	Online	I definitely oppose route E. They should start at minimum one street further North. Not right next to currently built developments. It's just not right.	Your comment and opposition of Segment E is noted. It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
214	3/23/2023	Brent Hoepfner	Email	<p>Steven from TXDOT,</p> <p>I thought they issued a resolution to expand 380 or build the bypass through Tucker Hill which is part of McKinney instead of a bypass running through Prosper and specifically the non-profit Main Gait. Main Gait has provided a resource for much needed therapy and volunteer opportunities for high school kids in the surrounding neighborhoods. Mayor Fuller is lobbying for the 380 business of McKinney, when they are the ones who benefit financially from the increase in traffic. We ask that TXdot hear our plight and not put the bypass through Prosper option B. It will most definitely cause a decrease in our home values, an increase in air pollution and noise pollution. It will negatively effect the existing schools and the new highschool going in off First street and the non-profit Main Gait. This is a McKinney issue, a result of poor planning and now they are trying to defer the negative results of this poor planning to Prosper! Many of the people of Prosper were not aware of this possibility when they purchased their homes. Please keep this highway bypass from going through the town of Prosper and ruining our community. Thank you,</p> <p>Whitley Place Prosper Resident Brent Hoepfner Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.
215	2/25/2023	Brett Guillory	Email	<p>NO to US380 Project Segment A, YES to Segment B</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Brett Guillory Stinebridge Ranch Residence</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
216	3/9/2023	Brett Lunde	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Brett Lunde	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
217	3/16/2023	Brett Talbot	Email	Mr. Stephen Endres, As a Stonebridge resident I strongly oppose Segment A. TxDot has a different option in Segment B. Segment B will cost less, reduce the tax burden, destroy fewer businesses and homes , and cause less disruption to thousands of Stonebridge Ranch residents and citizens of Mckinney. I STRONGLY support Segment B as the best option for US 380 Bypass from Coit Rd. to FM 1827. Thank you, Brett Talbot Stonebridge Ranch resident.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
218	3/16/2023	Brian A. Aguilar	Email	Mr. Endres, As a resident of the area under discussion, I am contacting you today to express my concern regarding the extension of the Comment Period. As I understand, the DEIS was completed and approved in December 2022 and designated Segment A as the Recommended Alignment. While I appreciate the thorough due diligence, precedent indicates that the standard for following process and protocols has been met. As such, the continuation of the Comment Period is unnecessary and unwarranted. No amount of additional dialogue will alter the conclusions and recommendations detailed in the DEIS...of the four (4) reasonable alternatives evaluated, the proper route for the Bypass is Segment A. TxDot should close deliberations and proceed accordingly with the Recommended Alignment. Segment A is, and will continue to be, the proper path forward. Respectfully, Brian A. Aguilar   Director of Corporate Accounts Philips Image Guided Therapy Devices 214.970.8535 [REDACTED]	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
219	3/7/2023	Brian and Jennifer Watkins	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
220	3/12/2023	Brian and Kay and Sydney and Sylvia Frank	Email	Mr. Endres, Txdot's decision to build the 380 bypass using option A is a mistake that should be corrected. The option A is more destructive option and more costly that should be avoided. Option B is more optimal, less disruptive, less costly and better for the people living in our community of McKinney. Running the new highway from Custer to Ridge rd. along the current 380 corridor is avoidable and a disaster waiting to happen. The homes in this area are too close to what will be the new highway. The sounds from the road will be significant and oppressive to children living in this area. The potential for an event of an East Palestine train wreck type scenario would unnecessarily expose families to potential harm and txdot would forever be held accountable for not knowingly avoiding this situation. Brian, Kay, Sydney, Sylvia Frank 7554 Hanover street McKinney Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.  A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.
221	3/7/2023	Brian and Linda Drees	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Brian&Linda Drees 6825 Studebaker Drive McKinney, Texas 75071 [REDACTED] Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
222	4/20/2023	Brian and Sarah W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A, YES TO SEGMENT B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
223	4/20/2023	Brian B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Oppose segment A. Yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
224	1/18/2023	Brian de la Houssaye	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I have the following questions:</p> <p>1. For the preferred route making US 380 a limited access road from Coit Rd. to approximately Ridge Rd. in McKinney, I can tell that the widening needed seems to come primarily from north of the existing US 380. However, I cannot tell which sections are elevated, at ground level or below ground level. Could you tell me for that section specifically between Custer Road and Stonebridge Parkway which of the 3 options it will be?</p> <p>2. Also, from the original materials provided by TXDOT, it appeared that leaving US 380 to turn north to Bloomingdale Road west of Custer Road was considerably less expensive, less intrusive to residences and displaced fewer businesses. In simple terms can you describe the analysis that showed turning north near Ridge Road made better economic sense?</p> <p>Thank you for your attention. Respectfully,</p> <p>Brian de la Houssaye 8508 Grand Haven Lane McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The freeway is shown at-grade (or at ground level) between Custer Road and Stonebridge Drive. For guidance on how to view and interpret a design schematic, please reference the Schematic Viewing Guide at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. Look for the "Profile View" which shows roadway elevations. You can also look for the magenta shading on the roadway, which represents proposed bridge deck (also referred to as elevated).</p> <p>Your comment is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B.</li> </ul>
225	1/23/2023	Brian de la Houssaye	Email	<p>Thank you, Stephen. I read through the EIS slides and, although I saw the written statements of the general assumptions used in the analysis, there were no specifics given for identifiable units (a single portion of land, business or residence). Knowing the actual values assigned to the mostly empty portions of land going through Frisco and Prosper farther to the west vs the costs of everything when deciding McKinney should bear the full brunt would help assuage a lot of I'll feeling. As it stands, the decision appears arbitrary. Brian</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. You can also reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33 and the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
226	3/7/2023	Brian de la Houssaye	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres, I am writing to ask you to review the decision process recently used by TXDOT to decide on Segment A versus Segment B for the proposed US380 Bypass. First and foremost, no one truly understands why it took TXDOT such a long time to decide on activity when 30 years ago it was evident DFW growth was northward and the ONLY potential east-west route to the far north was US380 because of Lake Louisville. After input from a number of parties TXDOT decided on Section A, which means virtually the entire bypass will go through McKinney, including much of McKinney that is already developed. This means the citizens of McKinney will have to absorb millions of unbudgeted dollars for traffic, of which in excess of 90% originates and terminates elsewhere. Instead of having a small portion of the bypass go through undeveloped sections of Prosper, virtually all of it will go through developed sections of McKinney. By TXDOT's own admission Section A is more expensive, longer and constitutes a less timely commute time than Section B, which would run through largely undeveloped land in both Prosper and McKinney. The disparity is even greater when taking into account TXDOT used very aggressive estimates for POTENTIAL relocation of major utilities. A major note of exception listed by TXDOT is that Section B would have passed close to ManeGait, a therapeutic horse center for children run by the Darling family on property contiguous to their homestead. Section B would require some of the Darling's property so the Darlings made an issue, claiming the bypass would create a deteriorated atmosphere for children riding nearby. I grew up on horses. I rode everywhere. Often on roadways. Traffic noise is a constant of the modern world. I am certain the Darling family is unhappy with Section B, but does that justify destroying businesses with Section A so they can preserve the peacefulness of their homestead? Does the potential future development of Prosper property justify the destruction of existing developed property in McKinney? Section A costs the taxpayers of McKinney and of Texas as a whole more than Section B. There is simply no justification for this decision unless there were factors opaque to the general public. Please reverse or investigate this decision.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. More information about the necessary steps to identify and address community impacts on a TxDOT project can be found at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf</a>.</p>
227	4/20/2023	Brian F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to the 380 bypass!	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
228	2/23/2023	Brian Frank	Online	<p>TXDOTS plan B is the least disruptive and less costly and obvious choice to the objective eye. It's perfect for this situation. Nothing but ranch lands. (The horse farm used as a crutch in the argument for using plan A goes mostly unused -do to terrible ownership- a huge majority of Prosper ISD sped students go to Blue Sky ranch as an alternative.) Plan A is a a terrible plan. It will cause irreparable damage to businesses and communities. There is not enough room to safely most eight lanes of traffic through the space between Tucker Hill entrance and the back yards in Stonebridge Ranch. It will be a matter of time before some terrible accident happens like the Ohio train derailment in this area. It's a huge risk to live and us being ignored by TXDOT. I promise you people will not forget the risk you are imposing on their lives.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>
229	4/20/2023	Brian Frank	Email	<p>I am writing in regards to the 380 by pass route A and its implications for our Tucker Hill family. We are a parent of a child who has been diagnosed 504 for learning issues etc. and is a young student at Reeves elementary in Auburn Hills. The 380 by pass would greatly affect the sensory issues she has with sound, and her respiratory problems related to air quality. Recently she has been riding a Prosper ISD school bus to Reeves every school day. The route A for the 380 by pass would run directly between our home and her elementary school. Therefore not only impacting her at home but also on her way to school and at the Reeves playground. Route A would be an unnecessary burden on her and students like her in our area. Route B is not only \$200 million cheaper its impact is far less on families/businesses currently living here! Please reconsider your choices. Take a second look at your data and new data and make the right choice of route B. Thank you Brian Frank Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Access to Tucker Hill would be maintained along the Preferred Alternative including an at-grade connection at Tremont Boulevard over the depressed section of the new freeway and a connection to existing US 380 east of Tucker Hill which would allow school buses and parents to access Reeves Elementary School via Auburn Hills Parkway and future Ridge Road.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
230	4/17/2023	Brian Habeck	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. NO to Segment A Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
231	3/15/2023	Brian Holdrich	Email	As a homeowner, in the Ridgecrest neighborhood, and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Brian Holdrich 6708 Falcon Ridge Lane McKinney TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
232	3/7/2023	Brian Hunsaker	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from Mail for Windows	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
233	4/20/2023	Brian M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
234	4/20/2023	Brian M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
235	2/25/2023	Brian Monteiro	Email	<p>Comment: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of Stonebridge Ranch, McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks, \Brian Monteiro Stonebridge Ranch Resident Mckinney, TX</p>	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
236	3/22/2023	Brian Sewell	Email	<p>March 22, 2023 Stephen Endres, Project Manager TxDOT Dallas District 4777 E US Highway 80 Mesquite, TX 75150 RE: Opposition to TxDOT's Preference of Segment A for U.S. 380 Bypass Project Dear Mr. Endres: I presume you have received a myriad of comments from Tucker Hill residents opposing the selection of Segment A for the U.S. 380 bypass project. As the president of Southern Land Company, the developer of Tucker Hill, I, too, vehemently oppose Segment A and respectfully ask you to reconsider. While my colleagues and I appreciate the work that went into the DEIS and the conclusions stated in the document, we believe Segment A will have significant negative impacts on the residents of the 381 homes in Tucker Hill. Segment B has been and remains Southern Land Company's preference. Segment B would allow Tucker Hill to remain connected to the City of McKinney, while Segment A would cut off Tucker Hill from the rest of the city. Segment B would not have the same or similar impact on any community in Prosper. It seems illogical to construct a bypass that would separate a sizable, significant neighborhood from the larger community when there is an alternate option that would not have this detrimental effect. Noise and air pollution are key concerns as well. The selection of Segment A would seriously jeopardize Tucker Hill residents' way of life, both during construction and once construction is complete and the bypass is traveled. Constructing a major highway up against our community would undoubtedly add noise and pollution and detract from the peaceful community residents know and love. When we designed Tucker Hill, we did so very intentionally. It was meant to be—and is—a unique community that offers residents a lifestyle they won't find elsewhere in the area. Outdoor living, abundant opportunities for activities and socialization, and inviting open spaces are hallmarks of the community. We have always wanted Tucker Hill residents to enjoy the outdoors and cultivate connections with their neighbors. Currently, they are able to do these things. This was the vision from the very start, and we are proud that it has become reality. Now, however, it is at risk. Segment B is undoubtedly a better option. It will help preserve the Tucker Hill experience. We urge you to select Segment B</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Several of your concerns are addressed, including community cohesion and air quality, in Appendix K, Section 4.3 of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>and allow residents to continue enjoying the life they carefully sought at Tucker Hill. Sincerely,                      Brian Sewell                      President                      Southern Land Company</p>	
237	2/18/2023	Brian Shaunessy	Online	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.  Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.
238	3/16/2023	Brittany Main	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
239	3/16/2023	Brittany Spann	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
240	2/22/2023	Brittney Morales	Online	I grew up in New Hope and route C will greatly impact my childhood home where my father still lives. Route D would be a better fit for the New Hope community as a whole. Please consider this as the primary route going forward.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.
241	3/7/2023	Brooke Allen	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Brooke Allen Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
242	1/16/2023	Brooke Carreker	Email	<p>Brooke Carreker                      2705 Kennedy Drive                      Melissa, TX 75454                      - Petition FOR Segment D                      - Petition AGAINST Segment C                      I am personally against the development of Segment D, because my family has a long history of driving the peaceful roads to and from a couple of horse barns in the area. Segment C would cut literally across White Horse which would be devastating to us and our community. Secondly - Segment D would be less disruptive to the residential communities in the area. My daughter went to Willow Wood. Segment D would be much better for our community. Thank you,                      Brooke Carreker                      214-790-1190</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>
243	3/6/2023	Brooke Carreker	Email	<p>I am writing, once again, to state my emphatic opposition to Segment C option of the 380 Bypass plan. Segment D is far less disruptive to our community. Thank you,                      Brooke Carreker                      2705 Kennedy Dr.                      Melissa, TX 75454                      214-790-1190                      Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>
244	2/6/2023	Bruce Dicus	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
245	4/20/2023	Bruce P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
246	4/20/2023	Bruce S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Pleas don't select Segment A. B is a much better option.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
247	4/20/2023	Bryce B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
248	4/20/2023	Buddy L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
249	4/3/2023	C. Beattie	Written Comment Form	Can we do a canvas of stonebridge to get the needed signatures? Why hasn't this been coordinated? I will help canvas stonebridge - we need to move forward on this asap? C. Beattie - 214-770-3001 [REDACTED]	Your comment is noted. In order for comments to be included in official documentation for the Public Hearing, they must be submitted to TxDOT by April 20, 2023.  While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
250	4/20/2023	C. M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I would like to add my voice in urging TxDot to implement Segment B for US 380 bypass from Coit Rd to FM 1827. I agree that 380 needs traffic congestion relief, however, doing so at the expense of area homeowners, when another, more viable option is available, is not acceptable and will make the area less desirable to live in.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
251	4/20/2023	Caleb M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The worst traffic on 380 is at school hours, which the expansion will not impact. I've personally driven down 380 at 5:30/6:00 without delay. The expansion using Segment A is too short to do any good, much like the now-to-be destroyed I-980 segment in Oakland, CA! The worst traffic around McKinney/Frisco is on Custer and Preston - not 380!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
252	3/16/2023	Caleb Nelson	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
253	1/19/2023	Caleb Pedersen	Online	<p>I am not in support of the "Blue Alternative" (Option A). When this freeway is constructed, it will clumsily divide a mature part of West-McKinney that sensibly balances commercial and residential interests. Many homes and business have already been built in this area within the last 10 years and many more are actively being constructed. This area is not conducive to an eight-lane freeway. The impact is not just relocating 22 residences and 35 business, but an overall drop in commercial spending and quality of life for residents due to elevated noise, decreased mobility on non-arterial roads, and an increase in traffic. Option A is unnecessarily and massively disruptive. Please consider Option B. The route is easier to navigate due to it's gradual slope from US 380 and less prone to traffic as Option A would be (the north-south connection to 380 will restrict flow of traffic). Additionally, the region impacted by Option A is less densely developed and impacts overall fewer residents.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The considerations you mention are some of the many factors TxDOT considered in its selection of the Preferred Alternative (Blue A+E+C). Engineering, social, economic, and environmental impacts have been thoroughly evaluated in the Draft EIS. For more information on the mitigation measures proposed, please refer to the DEIS.</p> <p>Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
254	2/6/2023	Cameron Hascal	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
255	4/20/2023	Camille C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose segment A. It is very irresponsible and will destroy our area of McKinney. The cost and damage to existing homes and businesses is just wrong.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
256	3/6/2023	Camille Chan	Comment Form	I have been a homeowner in Tucker Hill since August of 2020. When I purchased my home from Darling Homes I was not informed in any way of the drastic plans to change Tucker Hill from a charming, unique neighborhood that McKinney is proud to have, into a neighborhood surrounded by a major freeway to it's south and all along it's eastern side. Our quality of life will be dramatically and irreparably damaged. There will be so much noise pollution and damage to our air quality. This is not what I or any of my neighbors had any idea we would be living through. Not only that but a \$200 million cost above what segment B would cost. I implore you to reconsider segment B. If there is no way you will reconsider, than I beg you to please protect Tucker Hill with sound walls, with trees to block the walls and to make sure the eastern section of the freeway is as far east as possible and as low to the ground as possible to at least protect us somewhat. I thank you for your effort to work with Tucker Hill and to protect us from this devastating and heart breaking situation. Thank you, Camille Chan	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 -- 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>
257	2/17/2023	Camille Russu	Email	Stephen, I appose as does the majority of my neighbors the bypass A, this will make much more congestion in an area of 380 that is so congested now causing more problems. It makes more sense with a less populated area to do bypass B and stay out of the area that is already built up impacting less people and business. Your hurting an area of people with established homes and business because of a few people in the Prosper area that are complaining when this seems like the better route for all concerned. Maybe take a drive on 380 in rush hours from Coit to Lake Forest and see how congested traveling is. I avoid 380 at all possible cost and you will make things worse. Please consider a different route. Thank you, Camille Russu Resident of Ridgecrest	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
258	1/19/2023	Candace Niezgodzki	Email	<p>Hello Stephen,                      We received the attached notice regarding the US 380 Improvement Project. Looking at updated design for the “Blue Alternative, the above referenced property seems to be out of the project limits. Can you please confirm that the above address (RE: Proposed US 380 Improvements Project -Sonic Drive-in, 11601 US Highway 380, Crossroads, TX 76227 (RI#5143) is no longer considered within the project limits. Any additional information you may have is appreciated. Thank you,                      Candace Niezgodzki                      Associate, Right of Way, Condemnations, &amp; Real Estate                      Realty Income Corporation (NYSE “O”)                      2325 E. Camelback Rd., 9th Floor, Phoenix, AZ 85016                      www.realtyincome.com                      (O) 858-284-5275</p>	<p>The referenced property is not in the US 380 EIS project limits. It is in the US 380 Denton County project limits.</p> <p>More information about the US 380 Denton County project can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-denton-county-feasibility-study">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-denton-county-feasibility-study</a>.</p>
259	2/27/2023	Candice Odell	Online	<p>"I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:                      1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.                      2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.                      3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.                      4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.                      5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.                      6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.                      7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.                      I know this will be a difficult decision and we would just like to minimize the impact as much as possible.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
260	3/16/2023	Candie Arakaki	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
261	4/1/2023	Cara Skowronski	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Enders and Mr. Clemens, Thank you for taking comments regarding the 380 Project in Collin County, TX. I am a resident of the Tucker Hill neighborhood in McKinney. I am writing to request an additional extension of time to submit comments for the EIS as our lives, our homes, our health, and our safety will be potentially impacted daily by the actions of TxDOT. Our neighborhood leaders were waiting for a meeting with TxDOT engineers and experts to clarify some of our outstanding questions to help with our comments and after a month of waiting were told by TxDOT the meeting would no longer be an option. This has left us trying to sort out our study-related questions and hundreds of pages of analysis on our own over the past ten days. We have an outstanding list of questions regarding the noise and air pollution studies, mitigation, community impacts, traffic data, and the overall process. The city of McKinney has agreed to meet with our neighborhood leaders to help with our mitigation concerns, but that critical meeting, in order for us to submit proper comments, is pending a date that will likely not occur until after April 5. Our comments over the past 7 years have largely been shaped by what we learn from the TxDOT engineers and experts. According to the NEPA process, we know that once the comments have been collected, those comments are what help to shape the next steps of the FEIS and ROD. While a meeting with TxDOT would still be our preference, if we are left to continue to sort this out independently, we need more time. We were only given notice that our questions would not be answered on March 20, 2023. As the regulation allows for a longer comment period if deemed necessary to ensure the public and other stakeholders have sufficient time to review and provide meaningful input on complex or contentious projects, I hope we as homeowners and taxpayers can be afforded this patience and grace as we aim to learn more, respond thoughtfully, and protect our families and communities. Thank you, Cara Skowronski Cheltenham Ave, McKinney, TX 75071 ***** Cara M. Skowronski [REDACTED] 313.598.2758</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
262	4/20/2023	Carl H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
263	4/19/2023	Carlene Lower	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,  As a McKinney homeowner, I believe in selecting Segment A for the 380 bypass, TxDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents and will demonstrate significant fiscal irresponsibility. This decision is made more egregious with the existence of a viable lower impact alternative. It appears irrefutable that Segment B is the better alternative and that there are serious flaws in the conclusions reached by TxDOT and in the underlying Environmental Impact Study (EIS).</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
264	2/6/2023	Carlos Gaytan	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
265	3/7/2023	Carlos Guillermo Solomon	Email (3)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Carlos Guillermo Solomon 3320 Estes park Ln, Mckinney, TX 75070	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
266	3/7/2023	Carol Best	Email	I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 bypass from Coit Rd to FM1827. Thank you! Carol Best Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
267	4/20/2023	Carol C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please choose option A.	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.
268	3/16/2023	Carol Carrillo	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
269	3/16/2023	Carol Green	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,                      I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, business, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Personally, Route C will destroy an area that I have known and loved as a long-time resident of Collin County. If Route C is imposed we will lose access to community riding arenas, wooded trails, and outdoor pursuits. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable. Thank you for taking the time to consider this change. Sincerely,                      Carol Green</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
270	3/28/2023	Carol Keese	Email	NO to Segment A	Your opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
271	3/15/2023	Carol Ownby	Email	<p>Stephen, good morning! As a Tucker Hill resident, I DO NOT support the current TxDot decision on the 380 bypass for the following reasons: The increase in sound will happen; my home is on the far back of Tucker Hill and I can hear the noise now from the current 380 traffic. There is a stop light that slows traffic down but now it will be a full blown freeway at high speed. It will also be located very close to current homeowners whose lives and homes are in danger WHEN there will be an accident that causes trucks/cars to fly/veer off the road. Tucker Hill is the most unique of ALL neighborhoods in Collin County. It is a front porch neighborhood where families are always outside enjoying leisure time and exercise - something our country is losing so please don't take this away due to noise and pollution. Tucker Hill is a destination at Christmas as families in the surrounding area come to view the Christmas lights! It is a constant stream of cars throughout the holiday season. There is only one access/egress - how in the world will this be safe with an 8 lane freeway in front of our current entrance? Why would TxDot choose a much more expensive bypass? Taxpayers money There are other options and I do understand the need but this is a VERY poor choice Thank you for your consideration -</p> <p>Carol  Carol Ownby  Community Health Clinic, Chair  Board of Directors  214-686-4559</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>Because the proposed freeway mainlanes would be depressed (lowered) between Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch, it would be unlikely that vehicles would veer off the road into either neighborhood. There would be at-grade, lower speed frontage roads with stoplights between the mainlanes and Tucker Hill.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
272	3/15/2023	Carol Ownby	Online	<p>I DO NOT support the current TxDot decision            An increase in sound will happen; my home is on the back of Tucker Hill and I can hear the noise from 380. There is a stop light that slows traffic but now it will be an 8 lane freeway with more sound. It will also be located close to current homeowners whose lives/homes are in danger WHEN there will be an accident that causes trucks/cars to fly/veer off the road. Tucker Hill is the unique of ALL neighborhoods in Collin County. It is a front porch community where families enjoy outside leisure time and exercise - something our country is losing so please don't take healthy activities away. Tucker Hill is a Christmas destination as families in the surrounding area come to view the Christmas lights! It is a constant stream of cars during the holiday season. Only one entrance - how will this be safe with an 8 lane freeway in front of this entrance? 380 bypass is more expensive            There are other options - this is a VERY poor choice</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads. In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a bridge at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. The bridge will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It is important to note that there will be lower speed frontage roads which are between mainlanes/ramps and Tucker Hill. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. If the project was not constructed, the ability to provide safety improvements along the existing US 380 would be limited.</p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
273	4/20/2023	Carol S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to Segment A- b/c it'll cost millions more &amp; is a tax burden, it's more disruptive to area homeowners and the environment &amp; will negatively impact our health &amp; safety. Yes to Segment B.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>
274	4/20/2023	Carole H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to Segment A!</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
275	4/20/2023	Caroline I	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
276	4/17/2023	Carolyn Fredricks	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
277	4/20/2023	Carolyn P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please preserve our communities and businesses.	Your comment is noted.
278	3/16/2023	Carolyn Solis	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Carolyn Solis Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
279	2/17/2023	Carolyn Wilganowski	Online	The nature in McKinney is beautiful and something I have always admired as I grew up in a busy crowded city. C will damage one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County, and 71% more acres of forests and woodlands. There are threatened species that will have their homes disturbed. Not only are these species homes threatened, many families who have worked hard to build their life on their land will lose their homes. Choosing C would be an absolute catastrophe.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.
280	2/24/2023	Carrie Sheppard	Email	As a resident of Stonebridge Ranch, I am opposed to TxDOT's Preferred Alternative Segment A of the "Blue Alternative" and continue to Support Segment B as the best option available for this project. It is the least disruptive to businesses and homes and the least expensive option available as evidenced by the Segment Analysis developed by TxDOT in March of 2022 and February of 2023. Thank you, Carrie Sheppard	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
281	2/24/2023	Carrie Sheppard	Email	As a resident of Stonebridge Ranch, I would like to Carrie Sheppard	Your comment is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
282	3/7/2023	Carrie Sheppard	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Carrie Sheppard	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
283	3/15/2023	Cassie F. DeHart	Email	Hi Mr Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Cassie F DeHart 6509 Valley View Dr McKinney, TX. 75071 Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
284	3/16/2023	Caterina Kimes	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
285	4/20/2023	Catherine G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The decision between choosing Proposed segment A vs Proposed segment B CANNOT be based on public opinion regarding the MainGait Horse facility!! ALL points of comparison between the 2 proposed options make choosing Segment B the OBVIOUS route (based on COST, engineering feasibility, safety of route, traffic flow addressing the congestion at the intersection of 380 & Custer, impact to existing neighborhoods vs undeveloped land, utility complications,). At some point, the "popularity" & public campaign of ManeGait HAS to be set aside and facts need to be the deciding factors. Segment B makes sense!!	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
286	3/14/2023	Catherine Hinojosa	Email	Please, please consider changing the 380 bypass from route C to D. With route C you would be putting a HUGE freeway right next to a horse barn and extremely close to a house. This is not only a noise issue, but a safety and quality of life issue for both the people and the horses living there. So I urge you to reconsider your choice. Catherine Hinojosa	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.
287	2/23/2023	Catherine Kuehn	Comment Form	I have several concerns with my neighborhood and the location of the new highway @ 161 and Bloomdale Rd. I live in the Bloomridge community. 1. I want to know the air quality will be where there is traffic/pile up and several trucks and cars are sitting on the highway in front of my house at Bloomridge community. There was no study conducted on the air quality of all these emmissions. I want to see a quantative air quality study based on all the actual homes and traffic that could accumulate on that road. 2. The freeway will be up 10' at the point of my current entry to the community and there is no barrier wall projected. I want a barrier wall! it is bad enough that I will see this monstracity - I don't want to hear it as well! 3. I want to see what the frontage landscaped area of the removed existing Bloomdale Rd will look like coming into the community. I moved to my area to be more in the country and am devastated that an enormous highway is taking up more of the beauty that is McKinney. "UNIQUE IN NATURE" is a joke!	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 TIP. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the traffic noise analysis can be found in the DEIS in Section 3.14.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Bloomridge subdivision does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements for a noise barrier. Landscaping is generally coordinated with cities in future phases of a project.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
288	3/30/2023	Catherine Roberts	Online	<p>As a 6yr resident of McKinney, choosing to reside southeast of US380 and Custer Rd, I am writing to share my voice in support of Segment B - the segment which will A) require less development cost while also B) impacting fewer residents and businesses currently within McKinney city limits... less \$, less negative impact. This should be all that is required to make a commonsense decision without consideration for the noise, pollution, and negative impact that Segment A will further threaten all those, such as my family, who currently utilize the entrance of Stonebridge Dr to access US380. I chose to live within McKinney and found that US380 provides my family good access to cross my city on an as needed basis. Similarly, those who choose to cross East to West who do not wish to enter McKinney at all would be best served to "bypass" as much of the current city path as possible. As such, Segment B is the only Segment which makes sense for current residents and anticipated future travelers.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>
289	3/13/2023	Cathy Garrett	Online	<p>I firmly believe that all resources should be placed towards creating an appropriately planned and executed Outer Loop (sized for future growth!) as well as north/south thoroughfares feeding the Loop. However, IF a 380 bypass is to be developed the choice is clear ... Segment B! The decision between choosing Proposed segment A vs Proposed segment B CANNOT be based on public opinion regarding the MainGait Horse facility!! ALL points of comparison between the 2 proposed options make choosing Segment B the OBVIOUS route (based on COST, engineering feasibility, safety of route, traffic flow addressing the congestion at the intersection of 380 &amp; Custer, impact to existing neighborhoods vs undeveloped land, utility complications,). At some point, the "popularity" &amp; public campaign of ManeGait HAS to be set aside and facts need to be the deciding factors. Segment B makes sense!!</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
290	3/13/2023	Cathy Garrett	Email	<p>Good Morning to both of you!  I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period regarding the proposed 380 Bypass as members of our community need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by the proposed Segment Option A. I firmly believe that all resources currently being allocated to a proposed 380 Bypass should be placed towards creating an appropriately planned and executed 635-like Outer Loop (sized for future growth!) as well as north/south thoroughfares feeding the Loop. However, IF a 380 bypass is to be developed the choice is clear ... Segment B. The decision between choosing Proposed segment A vs Proposed segment B CANNOT be based on public opinion regarding the MainGait Horse facility (which could easily be relocated ... it just needs land)!! ALL points of comparison between the 2 proposed options make choosing Segment B the OBVIOUS route (based on COST to build and to taxpayers, engineering feasibility, short and long term affects of extreme increases in road/traffic noise, safety of route, traffic flow addressing the congestion at the intersection of 380 &amp; Custer, impact to existing neighborhoods vs undeveloped land, utility complications,). At some point, the "popularity" &amp; public campaign of ManeGait HAS to be set aside and facts need to be the deciding factors. Segment B makes sense!! I certainly appreciate you taking the time to listen to what the members of every community have to say on this issue ... not just ManeGait and Prosper.  Have a very Blessed week!  Cathy Garrett  859-559-2234  7413 Darrow Drive  McKinney, TX 75071  Live, Laugh, Love and Hold On</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing. Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>TxDOT has found that if we do nothing, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future, even if all the planned roadways in Collin County including the Outer Loop, are constructed. Therefore, a US 380 freeway is needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
291	3/28/2023	Cathy Garrett	Email	<p>Hello to each of you and thank you for taking time to hear from citizens regarding the proposed US Hwy 380 bypass in McKinney, TX. I have voiced concerns on public platforms but want to re-state those concerns here. In addition to prior comments I have some other thoughts as well. I firmly believe that all resources currently being allocated to a proposed 380 Bypass should be placed towards creating an appropriately planned and executed Outer Loop (sized for future growth!) as well as north/south thoroughfares feeding the Loop. However, IF a 380 bypass is to be developed the choice for the route on the western side is clear ... Segment B which provides a legitimate BYPASS approach around this area. There is NO reason for the city of McKinney and its residents to shoulder such a vast portion of the fiscal responsibility and "inconveniences" of the construction and long-term location of the bypass. Especially when much of the traffic congestion along US Hwy 380 is due to the growth of areas/cities to the east and west of McKinney ... yet we are being expected to pay for it?! The decision between choosing Proposed segment A vs Proposed segment B CANNOT be based on public opinion regarding the MainGait Horse facility!! ALL points of comparison that have been publicly</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>shared by TXDOT between the 2 proposed options make choosing Segment B the OBVIOUS route [based on the extreme increase in COST for segment A, engineering feasibility of the project (segment B would require several miles less be constructed)), safety of route (segment A utilizes two dangerous 90 degree turns for traffic!!!), traffic flow addressing the congestion at the intersection of 380 &amp; Custer, impact to existing neighborhoods vs undeveloped land, utility complications,). At some point, the “popularity” &amp; public campaign of ManeGait and the city of Prosper HAS to be set aside and facts need to be the deciding factors. Segment B makes sense!! Some of the additional concerns focus on the safety and health of the residents of our neighborhood - the Tucker Hill community in McKinney. Tucker Hill is a FRONT PORCH Living Community by name and design! Residents have chosen to live here for the peace and tranquility the location has to offer. It is an extremely outdoor-living focused neighborhood. The currently proposed bypass Segment A flanks Tucker Hill on not just one but TWO sides - both the south side AND the east side! (Consisting of 8 lanes of highway as well as 3 lanes of high speed “access road” traffic on each side of the highway!) The design will actually consume quite a bit of the land on the south side AND remove the ONLY current neighborhood entrance as we know it. The route along the east side of Tucker Hill will be a raised section of highway as well. Not only does Segment A completely isolate Tucker Hill from the city of McKinney it will envelope the area with constant, loud road noise! As the mom of a son on the Autism Spectrum who has sensory issues, we have an extreme amount of concern about the long-term effects that traffic noise inflicted on our neighborhood will have ... on ALL of its residents! I am CONFIDENT that the sound study presented by TXDOT segment A is fatally flawed and very much under calculates the amount of road noise our neighborhood will experience. As the proposed Segment A is currently drawn and Tucker Hill is isolated from the city of McKinney what will be the safety implications? Will citizens still be able to receive quick access from city safety personnel (ie police, EMT, fire)? Will we be able to quickly get from our community to the area emergency locations? The residents of McKinney deserve to receive transparency regarding the US Hwy 380 bypass decisions! How in the world would proposed Segment A be chosen over Segment B? This is a legitimate question that deserves an answer because Segment B (or something further west) still seems to be the extremely clear and logical decision! Thank you for your time and consideration!</p> <p>Cathy Garrett                      A very concerned McKinney, TX resident                      7413 Darrow Drive                      McKinney, TX 75071                      Live, Laugh, Love and Hold On</p>	<p>built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT’s (FHWA–approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS. That said, TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
292	3/28/2023	Cathy Garrett	Online (2)	<p>I firmly believe that all resources currently being allocated to a proposed 380 Bypass should be placed towards creating an appropriately planned and executed Outer Loop (sized for future growth!) as well as north/south thoroughfares feeding the Loop. However, IF a 380 bypass is to be developed the choice is clear ... Segment B! The decision between choosing Proposed segment A vs Proposed segment B CANNOT be based on public opinion regarding the MainGait Horse facility!! ALL points of comparison between the 2 proposed options make choosing Segment B the OBVIOUS route (based on COST, engineering feasibility, safety of route, traffic flow addressing the congestion at the intersection of 380 &amp; Custer, impact to existing neighborhoods vs undeveloped land, utility complications,). At some point, the "popularity" &amp; public campaign of ManeGait HAS to be set aside and facts need to be the deciding factors. Segment B makes sense!!</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
293	3/29/2023	Cathy Garrett	Online (2)	<p>Tucker Hill is a FRONT PORCH Living Community! Residents chose to live here for the peace &amp; tranquility it offers. Segment A flanks Tucker Hill on 2 sides &amp; completely isolates TH from the McKinney. It would envelope the neighborhood with constant, loud road noise! Our son is on the Autism Spectrum with sensory issues, so we have an extreme amount of concern about the long-term effects that traffic noise will have on our health (both mental and physical!) ... for ALL of our neighbors! I am CONFIDENT the sound study by TXDOT is fatally flawed &amp; very much under calculates the amount of road noise TH will experience. With TH being isolated from McKinney what will be the safety implications? Will citizens still receive quick access from city safety personnel (ie police, EMT, fire)? McKinney residents deserve transparency regarding 380 bypass decisions! How would A be chosen over B? This is a legitimate question to answer!. Segment B would be the extremely clear and logical decision.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS. That said, TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p>
294	3/16/2023	Cathy Thompson	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
295	4/20/2023	Cedric and Monica Cascio	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, I am a resident of the Tucker Hill neighborhood in McKinney, and am disturbed by TxDOT's decision to proceed with 380 - Segment A. Although the attached letter is pretty much what many of our neighbors are submitting, it is very well researched and says it all. Unlike my neighbors, I am an environmental professional. And although NEPA is not my field of expertise, I am very familiar with the process and the several components. I have read the EIS and cannot reach the conclusion that Segment A is the best way to proceed with the proposed bypass. The EIS conclusions and recommendations are inconsistent with much of the data as well as typical recommendations in similar circumstances elsewhere. In addition, I do not believe the effects to Tucker Hill were thoroughly studied, nor will they be properly mitigated. Unfortunately, this tends to make me believe "other" factors are at play. Please understand our concerns and take the suggestions in this letter seriously, and "upon the level". Sincerely, Cedric and Monica Cascio</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
296	4/20/2023	Cedric C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to Segment A. Insufficient noise reduction around Tucker Hill. Additionally, considering the substantial commercial growth west of Custer Rd, it seems the western portion of the bypass is too far east, making it obsolete before it even gets constructed.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
297	2/6/2023	Cesar Blanco	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
298	4/2/2023	Chad Ahlemeyer	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Chad Ahlemeyer	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
299	4/20/2023	Chad B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A, YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
300	3/16/2023	Chad Beattie	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
301	4/20/2023	Chad P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I oppose option A and vote for option B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
302	3/16/2023	Chad P.	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
303	4/20/2023	Chad T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	B is MILLIONS CHEAPER AND FAR MORE EFFECTIVE IN RELIEVING TRAFFIC	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
304	3/28/2023	Charisse Barnes	Email	I do not want segment A. I live in Stonebridge Ranch. This bypass would ruin the neighborhood of Stonebridge and Tucker Hill. Please do not pick Segment A. Go with segment B. Sincerely, Charisse Barnes Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
305	3/14/2023	Charles and Lisa Kallal	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Charles and Lisa Kallal	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
306	4/20/2023	Charles D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A!!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
307	4/19/2023	Charles E and Christine Henry	Email	To Whom It May Concern: My husband n I have been residents in Tucker Hill, since September of 2017! We moved here for the unique houses, landscaping, the front porch living, and peace and quiet of such a beautiful neighborhood! Since living in McKinney my husband has had a heart valve replacement & has diabetes & other health issues... I was diagnosed with a rare form of ovarian cancer in May 2021.... I go to MDA in Houston, for treatment and tests on a continuous basis. My husband & I both have many concerns regarding the proposed bypass & segment A! I do not believe there has been a fair & in-depth assessment on the noise factor. I do not think the dust, debris & pollution this construction will cause has legitimately been considered for those of us with major health issues in our community. Many in our community are of retirement age n there are also several young children who live in our community with severe health issues, that need to be considered! I submit the following questions: 1. Can you guarantee the air & pollution this major construction, will not cause any ill effects on the residence in our community? 2. Can you guarantee that the noise factor will do no harm to the	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with FHWA NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.  Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. TxDOT conducted a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis including benzene and VOCs (Section 3.12.3 of the DEIS), and a Carbon Monoxide Traffic Air Quality analysis (Section 3.12.2 of the DEIS), included in Appendix P of the DEIS. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>residents, considering the lengthy projected time frame of completion?            3. Can you guarantee that there will be a second entrance &amp; exit completed before any construction is started? Not only for residents, but for emergency vehicles &amp; etc. when there is a need.            I ask that TXDOT reconsider option B. Thank you for consideration!            Col. (Ret.) Charles E &amp; Mrs Christine Henry            Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 TIP.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
308	4/20/2023	Charles P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	YES to Segment B, NO to Segment A	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
309	3/7/2023	Charles W. Davis	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I—and West McKinney—strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Charles W. Davis (325) 794-6229 Sent from mobile device	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
310	3/28/2023	Charlette Vitz	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. The noise on 380 is already out of control and wakes me up in middle of night and we have wall blocking us that does nothing to help. I hate to see how bad it will be when 380 is larger and raised. Would you like to see this and hear this in your backyard? I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Charlette Vitz Wren Creek	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
311	4/20/2023	Charlotte B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
312	4/20/2023	Charlotte W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose option A and support Option B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
313	2/18/2023	Charmyne Crowe	Online	I believe option "A" best choice for bypass around McKinney	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
314	4/20/2023	Chase M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The project in its entirety ought to be scrapped. However, A will limit access to the neighborhood grocery stores and restaurants that serve a community. Route B places the freeway in a manner that does not divide a community, including hindering access to cheap grocery options for apartment living families. Additionally, with the opening of a Whole Foods along route A, the residents of multi-family residents will be hindered in accessing fresh food.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
315	2/16/2023	Chase Swim	Paper form	Highway will be going through our family property on 28 acres. Not only have I grown up on this property, I have all my memories growing up there. Some day this property will be mine and my childrems. We have 2 houses on the property and the highway goes inbetween them and the frontage roas takes out a house. Please choose another route. Do not choose route C choose D	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
316	2/26/2023	Chayse Harvard	Online (2)	I am reaching out in regards to the proposed improvements to US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 and, specifically, in hopes that you are considering Segment B. Hope to hear back from you soon. Going to A instead of B lacks common sense. Just think of the logic of this, isnt it better to have two roads instead of one? So, if they keep the existing road that'll carry 80k cars a day and if they take the new freeway it'll carry an extra 100k cars a day. If you make the road B the old 380 continues to carry 80k cars a day and the new 380 will carry over 100k cars a day which means two roads servicing the area which is very much needed in this time. I am also a resident of Tucker Hill and the Segment A tremendously effects this entire area. I'm the very least we need a sound barrier and assurance that construction will not hinder us from getting out-and-in the neighborhood.	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative (as well as all Build Alternatives) effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>Information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will also develop a detailed traffic control plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with stakeholders and residents through final design to minimize impacts to residences and neighborhoods, as feasible.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
317	3/28/2023	Chelsey Cole	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, As a homeowner of two houses and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Chelsey Cole	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
318	3/9/2023	Chelsey Crocker	Email	Good afternoon, As a homeowner in McKinney, I strongly oppose the construction of segment A for the US 380 bypass from Coit to FM 1827. Not only is this the more expensive option, it is the more destructive option. We support segment B that will cost less, reduce the tax burden for McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge residents. Another option I am wondering about is to just have the bypass start further down by Ridge road. The space between Coit and Stonebridge is not even the busy section of 380 comparatively. Getting onto the bypass at Ridge would be efficient at getting around the bulk of the busiest spots of 380 in this area. Please hear the residents and take these points into real consideration. Thank you!! Chelsey Crocker	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes. A new location freeway that diverges from US 380 at Ridge Road would potentially displace more existing residents than the proposed Segment A. It is also likely that there would be issues with impacts to community resources such as the Zinger Bat and Aviator ball parks.
319	3/28/2023	Cheryl Cherilus	Email	Good evening Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Cheryl Cherilus	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
320	3/28/2023	Cheryl Grey	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Cheryl Grey	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
321	4/5/2023	Cheryl Papciak-Brooks	Online	Option B makes much more sense than option A does. This bypass is not a "bypass " when it puts such more traffic in the McKinney city limits. I live about 1/2 mile from the option A route and the noise and traffic will increase exponentially in an already crowded area of 380. In addition, Custer and Stonebridge Roads will have much more traffic routed from the highway. Option B costs more than \$100 Million less, reduces the bypass travel distance and moves increased traffic further west on 380. From what I understand, option B also affects fewer residential areas. It's a much better option for the area. Please reroute to the option B plan.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix. Our comparison of Segments A and B showed that there was not a substantial difference in traffic metrics such as travel times, travel speeds, and Level of Service.
322	2/17/2023	Chet Fisher	Online	The significant concern I have is the logic for Segment C rather than Segment D. From speaking with Mr. Endres and Collin County officials, construction "cost" and the recommendation from the City of McKinney have been noted as the rationale for Segment C. Segment C is not in the City of McKinney, nor are the property owners impacted by C represented by the City of McKinney. While the "cost" of Segment D is ESTIMATED to be less than Segment C, you are not factoring in the tangible costs to the landowners and citizens that are directly impacted by Segment C. Segment D would clearly meet the stated need of the BYPASS with considerable less loss and cost to the Citizens of Collin County. Please change your recommendation back to Segment D, which was the prior recommendation. The voices of the Citizens who are directly impacted by Segment C should have more weight with TxDOT than the City of McKinney seeking to increase its tax base.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.  It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
323	3/8/2023	Chet Fisher	Email	<p>Mr. Endres- Thanks to you and your team for conducting the recent public hearings regarding the much-needed US 380 Bypass. As a resident of Collin County, I am requesting that TxDOT abandon proposed Segment C and instead utilize Segment D. With Segment D being primarily an elevated freeway over flood plains and non-inhabited areas, it is ideal for the stated purpose of a "bypass". While the estimated construction cost of Segment D is higher, it would avoid disruption of numerous homesteads, small businesses, and the way of life for many Collin County residents. The personal costs to these residents far out-weigh the estimated increase in construction cost. I respectfully request TxDOT utilize Segment D. Chet Fisher 1728 Private Road 5042 Melissa, TX 75454</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace segment residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>
324	4/20/2023	Chip M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>The TxDOT route is more expensive and adversely affects more businesses and residences than other routes.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p>
325	4/12/2023	Chloe E. Metzler	Email	<p>As a Tucker Hill resident, I believe in selecting Segment A for the 380 bypass, TxDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents and will demonstrate significant fiscal irresponsibility. This decision is made more egregious with the existence of a viable lower impact alternative. It appears irrefutable that Segment B is the better alternative and that there are serious flaws in the conclusions reached by TxDOT and in the underlying Environmental Impact Study (EIS). First, the facts as TxDOT presents them appear to support Segment B over Segment A:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Segment A is one mile longer, has 6 new interchanges rather than 5, has seven potential major utility conflicts versus just two for Segment B and displaces 15 businesses versus zero businesses for Segment B.</li> <li>• Segment A would encroach on twice the wetland acreage, nearly twice the linear feet of rivers and streams and more acreage of forests, prairies and grasslands than Segment B. Segment A impacts more than 30 irreplaceable Heritage trees, aged over 150 years. Finally, there would be no hazardous material sites impacted on Segment B and TxDOT has identified 2 with Segment A.</li> <li>• Segment B is significantly less expensive than Segment A. Of real concern to the taxpayers is that the estimated cost to construct Segment A is nearly \$200M more than Segment B.</li> <li>• Segment A involves reconstructing an additional 3.8 miles of existing 380 Highway increasing the risk of work zone accidents and disrupting existing traffic patterns. Additionally, priority has not been given to safety and the increased risk of fatal accidents, including those induced by a change in grade and, not one, but two 90 degree turns.</li> <li>• TxDOT has claimed that Segment A results in lower potential impacts to planned future residential homes. It appears that TxDOT is prioritizing the</li> </ul> </p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. A Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers. Details of the traffic noise analysis and location of the noise receivers can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>By far the issue that TxDOT has heard about the most from the public and stakeholders on the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study and this EIS project has been direct and indirect impacts to ManeGait. Based on that, it was one of the many things that TxDOT considered. The numerous other considerations can be found on the Segment Analysis Matrix.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>impact of unidentified future residents, property investors or developers over the impact of existing McKinney residents. The voices of the current residents should be a priority over unidentified future residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TxDOT has asserted that Segment A avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road. Once again, this appears to accrue to the benefit of future residents or current investors, not the current residents of McKinney.</li> <li>• TxDOT also asserts that Segment A avoids impact to “MainGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern”. The facility does serve a noble purpose, but TxDOT has not factored in McKinney residents directly impacted who include retired veterans, disabled residents (both young and old), seniors 55+ and countless children. More concerning to members of the McKinney community is how Bill Darling leveraged his ownership of 43 Tucker Hill lots to submit comments against Segment B in favor of Segment A – essentially impersonated residents of Tucker Hill for his personal gain. TxDOT’s own findings indicate that the continued emphasis on ManeGait is unwarranted and has stated Segment B “would not make the ManeGait inaccessible to persons with disabilities and would not violate the Americans with Disabilities Act.”</li> </ul> <p>Chloe E. Metzler</p>	<p>of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under “NEPA Assignment”, TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ’s NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>
326	4/20/2023	Chloe M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	YES to Segment B!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
327	3/7/2023	Chris	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. And that was the form letter— this is the straight up answer— Segment A is shortsighted and stupid.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
328	3/16/2023	Chris Adams	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
329	3/8/2023	Chris and Amber Evans	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Amber Evans Chris & Amber Evans [REDACTED]	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
330	4/20/2023	Chris C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	It is the responsibility of our government to use tax payer funds in a responsible manner - Cost of Segment A burns up an excess of \$99 million or more than Segment B. Building segment A is fraud, waste and abuse of tax dollars.	Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.
331	4/20/2023	Chris G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
332	2/21/2023	Chris Harrison	Comment Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- C divides residential and farming/ranching communities</li> <li>- C affects and displaces more: residences (C -29 / D - 7), businesses (C-15/D-4), community resources (C-7/D-0)</li> <li>- C damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>- C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands</li> <li>- C disturbs wetlands and suitable habitat for threatened species</li> <li>- C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers D)</li> </ul> <p>C has worse traffic performance! Lower traffic capacity, longer travel times, slower travel speeds and more dangerous elevation changes.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
333	4/20/2023	Chris L. Self	Email	<p>I second this opinion of my husband!                      Also, when are we going to be provided with the financials explaining why a \$200m+ project makes fiscal sense over Segment A? Regards,                      Chris                      Chris L. Self, General Agent/Broker                      214-707-6056 (cell)                      214.544-8536 (fax)</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
334	3/19/2023	Chris Price	Online (2)	I am a resident of Prestwyck & I would like to comment about the design change to 380 & Prestwick Hollow Dr. I support the original design with an underpass of 380 at Prestwick. First when parents drop their children off at Hughes Elementary, which is located off Prestwick Hollow, they will no longer travel to 380 to go westbound, instead they will travel to Coit road to do so. Coit is very congested, especially during school hours. Without a traffic light at Coit & 380, it would be difficult to handle the additional traffic at this intersection, as the proposal is to limit the amount of traffic at 380 & Prestwick, if the proposed design change stands. Second, if a way to cross 380 at Prestwick is removed, then the connection to the proposed Market Street grocery (NE Coit & 380) would be limited by pedestrian or bicycle access. Third, there isn't a deceleration lane on Eastbound 380 at Prestwick, which will now be the only way to turn at this intersection. Please keep the old design	<p>Your comment and support for the previous design at Prestwick Hollow Drive and the future US 380 is noted. The updated design removed the connection between the frontage roads at Prestwick Hollow Drive because it was planned to be removed when the entire US 380 project was constructed. An underpass was not proposed at this location.</p> <p>Prestwick Hollow Drive would be accessible only by the eastbound frontage road. Westbound traffic would need to make a U-turn at Coit Road, approximately 0.36 miles west of Prestwick Hollow Drive. Those wanting to travel west from Prestwick Hollow Drive would need to drive 0.65 miles east then make a U-turn at future Independence Parkway. Prestwyck residents could take Prestwick Hollow Drive to Coit Road, then turn onto the east or westbound frontage roads at the grade-separated interchange.</p> <p>In the next phase of the project, TxDOT will evaluate if a signal would be warranted at the future US 380 and Coit Road.</p>
335	4/20/2023	Chris R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B provides a more direct east-west route for the bypass, and is cheaper. Do The Right Thing.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
336	3/1/2023	Chris Roberts	Email	To the office of Stephen Endres, As a resident of Collin County, I am urging you to oppose the Route C proposal for the US 380 Bypass in NE McKinney. With a clear, decent alternative (Route D), there seems to be no need to choose the poorly-planned and destructive Route C. Route C destroys more wetland, more forest, and more grassland than Route D, and displaces more homes and businesses. Additionally, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department strongly opposes Route C, a clear sign that this proposed segment is reckless. The residents of McKinney and surrounding communities treasure our green space, as do the other various species that use these wetlands and forests. We can't deny that we must urbanize to some capacity as North Texas grows. However, this process must be done with respect to both our public and private green spaces. It is your responsibility to make sure we urbanize responsibly, and I believe Route C punts on that responsibility. I urge you to make Route D the preferred route. Thank you for your time, Chris Roberts 715 Range Dr. Princeton, TX 75407	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. The project team analyzed the areas around Segments C and D through multiple in-person field visits where Right of Entry (ROE) was granted, use of aerial imagery/maps, and existing databases including Collin County Appraisal District listings.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. It outlines that for an EIS project, TxDOT is supposed to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things that TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
337	3/8/2023	Chris Roberts	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Chris Roberts</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.</p>
338	4/20/2023	Chris S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to segment A!! YES to segment B</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
339	3/6/2023	Chris Self	Online	<p>I'm against your Option A selection. How can you justify an additional \$200m+ for this project? What a waste of money! And, why weren't the permits held up in Prosper for 'future' builds like they were in McKinney? I'm hoping we can all have a face to face meeting where you can show us/prove to us that this is the best option for current residents instead of basing your decision on 'future' residents. Also, what was the reasoning behind not even offering Tucker Hill a sound barrier wall that was originally discussed? I look forward to us having a face to face prior to considering legal counsel.</p> <p>Chris Self 2312 Tremont Blvd (Tucker Hill) McKinney Tx 75071</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p>
340	3/15/2023	Chris Stroud	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>As a Prosper resident and person who owns a business in McKinney, I want to voice my support, again, for Route A. I am sure you are well versed in all of the reasons why this would be the ideal route. First I would like to quote TXDOT's own EIS report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It would require the least amount of now right of way.</li> <li>2) It would not displace any community facilities (Such as ManeGait, an organization of the utmost importance to the Collin county community which would unduly be impact by the alternate B route)</li> <li>3) Results in the least number of noise receptors with substantial noise level increases</li> <li>4) Be the least impactful on flood plains and regulatory floodways</li> <li>5 )Minimize the conversion of farmland</li> <li>6) Meet the project Purpose and Need.</li> </ol> <p>Additionally, Prosper has continued to develop as a master planned community with the idea that US380 would be a freeway, changing the route to cut through a significant portion of Prosper would disproportionately affect the Town of Prosper's commercial real estate, and new developments which support its tax base. This would in turn have other down stream effects on Town parks, schools, students, teachers, and residents. I implore you to make a final decision regarding this bypass and stick with the blue route as recommended by TXDOT's own EIS study. Continued delay and discussion has significantly and negatively affected the Collin County community. Thank you,</p> <p>Chris Stroud</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.</p>
341	3/7/2023	Chris Wilkes	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				Chris Wilkes Chris	
342	3/10/2023	Christie Abraham	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Christie Abraham	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
343	4/20/2023	Christina D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
344	2/17/2023	Christine Bodin	Online	We live in the Kensington neighborhood of Stonebridge Ranch, which is directly off of 380. We noticed you did not choose Option B, which would have had much less impact on businesses, homes and nature/wetlands, and would cost millions less...which doesn't make any sense at all why you all didn't choose B over A. However, we are now asking that you do NOT go with the Inset C: Alternative Design. Our street is literally Freedom Drive and the Alternative Design appears to make an exit directly onto Freedom Drive...which is insanely awful. So, if it matters at all to you who don't live in McKinney or anywhere near Freedom Drive, please do not go with the Inset C: Alternative Design.	Your comment and opposition to Inset C is noted. Based on the schematic design shown at the Public Hearing, Inset C does not show a ramp from the future US 380 freeway directly to Freedom Drive. A driver would have to slow down, exit the freeway frontage roads, and then get onto University Drive. Eastbound traffic would need to take a right turn to access Freedom Drive. The US 380 freeway is anticipated to attract future traffic from the existing US 380 (University Drive).
345	4/20/2023	Christine C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A!!!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
346	4/20/2023	Christine H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
347	4/20/2023	Christine W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A is unnecessary and will add even more traffic to 380.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
348	4/20/2023	Christopher T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
349	3/10/2023	Christopher Thompson	Online	The segment of highway between Tucker Hill and Stonebridge has houses roughly equal distance from the current and proposed 380 alignment. Residences on both sides of the highway have a direct line of sight to the proposed roadway. However, a noise barrier has only been proposed on one side of the highway. It is unclear why one side would have more of an acoustic impact vs the other and if sufficient noise analysis has been done and made available to the public. If there is a reasonable justification, results should be made available to the public for independent review and analysis. From the outside looking in, it seems logical that a sound barrier would be needed on both sides of the highway given the similarity of conditions on either side.	Your comment and concern about noise is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.
350	4/20/2023	Christy E	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A !	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
351	2/21/2023	Christy Millard	Email	<p>Stephen, I am writing to strongly urge you to choose Segment D. Segment D is a better choice for so many reasons. Specifically, far fewer homes and businesses would be affected. In addition, Segment C disrupts forests and wetlands that are habitats for threatened species. Texas Parks &amp; Wildlife opposes C for these reasons. And based on studies, C will even have worse traffic performance. The only logical and right choice is Segment D. Christy Millard</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. It outlines that for an EIS project, TxDOT is supposed to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things that TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
352	4/20/2023	Chuck D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly OPPOSE the proposed \"Segment A\" plan for the upcoming 380 bypass road project.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
353	3/7/2023	Chuck Davis	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Chuck Davis McKinney, Texas HSU Board of Trustees, Vice Chair (325) 794-6229	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
354	4/18/2023	Chuck Davis	Email	I am a homeowner, Texas taxpayer and citizen of McKinney, TX. I strongly OPPOSE the construction of "Segment A" for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. We, the 200,000+ voters and taxpayers of McKinney, understand that TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. If TXDoT proceeds with the far more costly and disruptive "Segment A," it will be seen by the voters of McKinney as our State government "pandering to" the interests of large developers, and a betrayal of the average citizen. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Chuck Davis 5800 Spring Hill Dr. McKinney, TX 75072 (325) 794-6229 Sent from mobile device	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
355	3/20/2023	Chuck Hamilton	Email	I appreciate the many opportunities for public comment and input. There is no perfect solution. As a regular user of US 380 and resident of Collin County, I would like to share my support for TxDOT's current preferred routing - Segments A, E, and C. No option will cause no disruption, and the due diligence connected to the current preferred route leads me to support this proposal. Thank you, Chuck Hamilton	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
356	4/20/2023	Chuck K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am here supporting the NO to Segment A and YES for Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
357	2/21/2023	Chuck Vanzant	Online	Based on the fly over video, there will be so many people affected by the preferred plan. New businesses around the Custer Road/380 intersection and then those to the east will be devastating. The impact to the community on either side of 380 around Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch is tragic. The bypass should be located further out in areas less developed and less intrusive to the existing homeowners. The consultants and the TX Dot people should be ashamed,	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.
358	4/20/2023	Cindy A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Noooooooooooooo to A! Yes to B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
359	4/20/2023	Cindy A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
360	3/7/2023	Cindy Beauregard	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
361	4/20/2023	Cindy G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote NO to prop. A and yes to B. We don't need all of the destruction. I also kindly request that you use stop lights instead of roundabouts. Stop lights are much safer. Please no roundabouts!!!	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>There are no roundabouts included in the design for this project. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>
362	4/20/2023	Cindy H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A.... YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
363	4/20/2023	Cindy K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is by far the most intelligent way to go. Segment A cost much more money to construct and will impact many more citizens.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
364	3/8/2023	Cindy Kumpa	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Cindy Kumpa 3317 Drip Rock Dr McKinney, Tx 75070 [REDACTED]</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
365	3/8/2023	Cindy Maki	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
366	4/4/2023	Cindy Schneible	Email	I'm writing to submit my comments re: the proposed alignment for the 380 bypass. I am in favor of Segment B (Coit to Ridge). I oppose selection of Segment A. Cindy Schneible 201 Mallard Lakes Drive McKinney, TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
367	4/20/2023	Clarence P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
368	3/28/2023	Clarke Drummond	Email	Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Clarke Drummond	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
369	4/20/2023	Claudine B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A. Segment B will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, result in less disruption and require fewer businesses and homes to be destroyed. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 bypass from Coit road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
370	3/8/2023	Clay East	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
371	4/20/2023	Clay G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A does NOTHING to move traffic east or west! Segment B is consistent with the purpose of the new roadway. Only B makes any sense. It is the highest and best use of the public's funds.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
372	2/4/2023	Clay Johnson	Online	No! No more widening of 380. 380 needs to reduce speed limits and increase lights in Prosper.	Your comment and opposition to the project is noted.
373	4/20/2023	Clay Y	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option A is irresponsible! Option B makes much more sense financially & environmentally!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
374	2/25/2023 2/26/2023	Clay Yonts	Email (1) Online (1)	Good evening Stephen, I'm writing you as a concerned community member at 2601 Addison St. in Tucker Hill. I can't believe we're letting small-town politics be the determining factor in this decision!! Option B has been the smartest and least expensive option from the get-go. Tucker Hill, Stonebridge, Wren Creek, and some of the other neighborhoods that are going to be directly impacted, did not have fair representation in the early public comment. This makes absolutely no sense! Bill Darling's financial campaign contributions to four of the seven city council and city mayor has influenced them to not push back, which in turn would cost tax payers way more money. Financially, having the least environmental impact, traffic congestion, and the amount of businesses that will be directly impacted and displaced, it all very strongly suggests opposite option B as the best route. A bypass or a loop is created to divert the traffic to lessen congestion. If that is the true goal for this bypass, then you would want to get traffic off of 380 as quickly as possible. Option A keeps the bypass on 380 longer, which in turn creates more traffic congestion, which is the opposite reason for creating this! Thanks, Clay Yonts	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. Public input is an important factor but it is not the only factor that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS.  Adjacent property owners from all studied alternatives were notified of all public meetings and input opportunities.  The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
375	3/13/2023	Clay Yonts	Email	<p>Good morning, I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. Thanks, Clay Yonts 2601 Addison St. Mckinney</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
376	3/15/2023	Clay Yonts	Online	<p>As a McKinney resident, I find TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A vs. Segment B fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers and places an unsupportable financial burden on the City of McKinney and its taxpayers!! Findings of the Environmental Impact Study should have led to selection of Segment B. No businesses displaced, rather than 15 current businesses displaced in Segment A. 2 rather than 7 major utility conflicts in Segment A No hazardous material sites impacted, rather 2 in Segment A. Nearly twice the impact to rivers and streams; ½ mile vs. 1 mile Segment A impacts more than 30 irreplaceable Heritage trees, aged over 150 years. Segment B saves over \$150 million dollars for Collin County Taxpayers vs. Segment A \$153M in right of way costs, rather than \$198M in Segment A. \$25M in utility relocation costs, rather than \$75 in Segment A. \$588M in design and construction costs rather than \$608M in Segment A. \$40M savings in utility relocation for the City of McKinney.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
377	4/20/2023	Clay Yonts	Online	<p>I am concerned about safety during construction and beyond and do not feel the study adequately addressed safety and access to our neighborhood during and after construction. The entrance/exit of our neighborhood will be a giant mess and a huge safety concern. We have elderly and disabled neighbors that need every second they have in the event of an emergency. Tucker Hill is a front-porch community by design and given the amount of time spent outside and, in our community, I am concerned about air quality and noise and do not feel they were adequately addressed nor were our facilities and neighborhood type properly identified in the study. How will emergency response time be affected during the construction period? Has TxDOT studied the full impact of air quality during and after construction? Where were the air quality monitors located for the current study?</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each are accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
378	4/20/2023	Clint K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>The cost to tax payers and the number of real-live people/businesses impacted should drive this decision. Please, please don't sell out when real lives are being adversely impacted!</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
379	3/7/2023	Clint Kaeding	Online	<p>Option A bypass makes absolutely no sense in terms of the things that SHOULD matter the most. It's FAR, FAR more costly to tax payers and FAR more disruptive to EXISTING home owners and businesses. This feels very much like political corruption from my vantage point, as a few powerful (wealthy) people (e.g., Bill Darling) appear to be getting their way while the vast majority get screwed. I'm sure it's nothing new in the realm of Government and politics, but that doesn't mean it's not completely &amp; utterly WRONG. We (in Tucker Hill) are bearing the worst of this injustice, as we're being strangled on 2 sides by freeways. There are hundreds of kids in our neighborhood alone who will be significantly impacted by this, and our front-porch neighborhood is going to lose much of its appeal and undoubtedly plummet in value while a small minority profit from our pain. This is flat out WRONG, and I would love to hear someone explain it in a truly rational way that doesn't wreak of malfeasance.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. After discussions during the Feasibility Study with stakeholders, TxDOT started to develop the design to depress the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods on Segment A to decrease noise impacts and visual barriers.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
380	3/13/2023	Clint Kaeding	Email	<p>I would like to formally request an extension of the comments period, as we need more time to fully evaluate the impact and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill and the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. Respectfully, Clint Kaeding Sr. Manager, Strategy &amp; Delivery Customer Support and Services Cell - (913) 748-5412 Work - (469) 603-3706</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
381	3/11/2023	Clint Kaeding	Email	<p>Stephen,                      My wife, Katy and I submitted our comments to the TxDot site, but have heard that some previous comments from our neighborhood were either not received or “lost” (there doesn’t seem to be any record of them in the public records for many of us who submitted them), so I’m following up with an email. To be blunt, the current “preferred route” (Option A - Blue alternative) makes absolutely NO sense in terms of the things that SHOULD matter the most. It’s FAR, FAR more costly to tax payers and FAR, FAR more disruptive to EXISTING home owners and businesses (vs. the “planned developments” that Prosper quickly stood up as deterrents to routing through their open/unoccupied land). TxDot seems to be choosing to impact real, actual people and businesses at the expense of future/hypothetical developments that aren’t even in existence yet. The whole thing feels very much like political coercion/corruption from my vantage point, as a few powerful/wealthy people appear to be getting their way while the far larger majority get screwed. I’m sure it’s nothing new in the realm of Government and politics, but that doesn’t mean it’s not completely and utterly WRONG. We (in Tucker Hill) are being “asked” to bear some of the worst of it, as the Blue Alternative would wrap our neighborhood with freeways on 2+ sides, severely detracting from the appeal of our front-porch community, and having devastating impacts on our property values. The same goes for many other EXISTING homeowners and businesses that far outnumber those impacted by Option B (gold alternative). Expanding 380 is one thing, but choking out our neighborhood with a 380-expansion AND a bypass is more than any neighborhood should be forced to endure. This may be a moot point if the expansion of 380 is happening regardless of where the bypass goes, but has anyone even considered modernizing the Traffic Light synchronization on 380??? It’s truly baffling to me how terrible the current setup is relative to so many other parts of the country I travel to (including Overland Park, KS where we moved from 3 years ago as just one very similar example). We routinely sit at stoplights on 380 for 90-120+ seconds with periods of virtually no oncoming traffic at all preventing us from making a turn, only to finally get a green light once a caravan of people are approaching. And this is not at all an anomaly... it happens over and over every single day! We also sit at red lights while there’s a green turn arrow for roads that doesn’t even exist and nobody in the turn lane (e.g., Stonebridge, Ridge, etc. north of 380). It’s incredibly frustrating. Multiply these completely pointless stops/starts/stop/starts/stop/starts... by the thousands and thousands of people trying to move along 380 and I guarantee that HUGE strides could be made in traffic flow if hundreds-of-thousands of minutes weren’t being wasted every single day by people sitting idle at these arbitrary/illogical traffic lights. I travel a lot and there are countless other areas of the country that have figured this out, so I know it is technically possible and far less disruptive. We understand that continued growth is inevitable (and not at all a bad thing) and that something has to be done for the infrastructure to support it. But any such solution should be driven by 1) What is most cost-effective (highest ROI), and 2) What will adversely impact</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT has not identified any comments that weren’t received or lost. Your comments are included on pages 542, 764, and 2033 in the Public Meeting summary at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPROVED%200135-02-065etc%20US380_PublicMeetingDocumentation_1%20of%204_08.16.2022.pdf">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPROVED%200135-02-065etc%20US380_PublicMeetingDocumentation_1%20of%204_08.16.2022.pdf</a>. Other comment response matrices presented by TxDOT can be found at Drive380.com.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>The proposed project would construct a freeway, which would limit access to freeway mainlanes to only on and off ramps and does not have signalized intersections. Typical section drawings are posted on the Public Hearing website.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>the fewest REAL people (not future/hypothetical). I don't see how anyone can honestly make the claim that the current proposal checks either of these boxes. If there's something I'm missing that takes precedence over these, then I'd like you to explain. Respectfully,                      Clint Kaeding                      Sr. Manager, Strategy &amp; Delivery                      Customer Support and Services                      Cell - (913) 748-5412                      Work - (469) 603-3706</p>	
382	4/19/2023	Clint Kaeding	Email	<p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
383	3/24/2023	Clint Moss	Email	<p>Mr. Enders,                      I live in Prosper and am writing to support the recent TxDOT recommendation of the 380 bypass being placed in McKinney, east of Prosper City limits. As noted in TxDOT's own EIS report, this placement is advantageous for the following reasons:                      1. Requires the least amount of right of way                      2. Would not displace any community facilities                      • Numerous residential and commercial facilities that are already present or in construction would be negatively impacted if bypass cut through Prosper. This disproportionately impacts Prosper and our potential tax basis given that Prosper is of significantly diminished size compared to McKinney, who can absorb the tax impacts much easier.                      3. Result in the least number of noise receptors                      4. Be least impactful on flood plains and floodways                      5. Minimize the conversion of farmland                      6. Meet the project Purpose and Need                      I implore you to please make a final decision to keep the currently recommended bypass, east of Prosper, as recommended by TxDOT's own EIS study. This decision seems to be the least impactful to residents, commercial entities, and cities. Do not let political pressure (Keith Self, allegedly) sway your decision to benefit a handful of individuals while negatively impacting tens of thousands of others. Thank you for your understanding.                      Clint Moss                      3831 Glacier Point Ct                      Prosper, TX</p>	<p>Your comment and support of the project is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
384	2/17/2023	Clint Tenney	Online	<p>I am here to oppose option C and support option D for the following reasons  D was the proposed option that made the most sense.  C Divides peoples property especially residential and farmland.  C damages forests which Collin County is beginning to run low on.  C disturbs wetlands and will have flooding be an issue.  C is short sighted for the amount of growth coming to this area.  Please do option D.</p>	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
385	3/7/2023	Clint Tucker	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.  Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
386	3/7/2023	Cody Hill	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.  Cody  1116 Bristlewood Dr  McKinney TX 75072</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
387	2/20/2023	Colin Woodward	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, I am writing to strongly urge you to choose Segment D. Segment D is a better choice for so many reasons. Specifically, far fewer homes and businesses would be affected. In addition, Segment C disrupts forests and wetlands that are habitats for threatened species. Texas Parks &amp; Wildlife opposes C for these reasons. And based on studies, C will even have worse traffic performance. The only logical and right choice is Segment D. Sincerely, Colin Woodward</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. It outlines that for an EIS project, TxDOT is supposed to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things that TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
388	4/20/2023	Colleen P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly Oppose Segment A! I support Segment B as a better option.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
389	4/20/2023	Colleen S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Although either route doesn't affect my home, I am absolutely opposed to segment A. Why would we choose a more expensive option that disrupts fewer businesses and homes? Not to mention it doesn't 'bypass' enough, doesn't bypass Custer. Please do the right thing and choose segment B.	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p>
390	3/15/2023	Colleen Shamburger	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes. I am concerned that the more expensive option doesn't really bypass the intersection at Custer? I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Thanks! Colleen Shamburger 6304 Castle Rock Circle McKinney TX 75071 214-762-3261</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
391	2/16/2023	Concerned Citizen	Paper form	We will NOT vote to fund option A.	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
392	3/16/2023	Connie Baxter	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
393	3/7/2023	Connie Brown	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
394	4/20/2023	Connie E	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>We are vehemently opposed. We can't attend local meetings due to health, but it makes no sense to uproot so many businesses. From what we have read, you've never provided good reasoning for your adherence to this plan when other plans would be less disruptive. We are registered voters and will not vote for any local funds to support this plan.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
395	4/20/2023	Connie S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Why are you choosing the more expensive disruptive route? You have my email....I would love to hear the reasoning behind your decision to push for Segment A. Common sense dictates Segment B...as well as your stewardship to the taxpayers money. I anxiously await your reply.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p>
396	4/20/2023	Conrad K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Apparently this Segment A choice is purely POLITICAL for some groups in Prosper. Totaly illogical that taxpayers should pay a million more for the Segment A option that would potentially displace so many homes and businesses compared to Segment B. It is time to be responsible to your taxpayers.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
397	3/15/2023	Corey Anne Snowert	Email	<p>Mr. Stephen Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. Based on the fact that Segment B is obviously the least disruptive option, it will be obvious to the residents of McKinney that this choice was not made in the best interest of our community but instead due to unethical bribes and politics I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Concerned McKinney Resident, Corey Anne Snowert</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Public input is an important factor but it is not the only factor that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS. No final decision regarding an alignment will be made until TxDOT reviews and considers all timely public input.</p>
398	3/16/2023	Corina Constantine	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Corina Constantine</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
399	2/21/2023	Courtney Fuller	Online	<p>I moved to the Willow Wood neighborhood while it was first being built. I was immediately attracted to the quietness and "slowness" I felt coming from working downtown in a loud, dirty, messy environment. My kids go to school in a safe community away from the hustle and grind. It is clean, quiet, calm, and beautiful. I love being close to the creeks, fields, farms and other beautiful land that you do not often see in many areas of Dallas. Segment C would cut right through our neighborhood and cause disruption, noise, dirty air, and overall chaos to a place my family chose to build our family and life in. I highly oppose to segment C. Segment D would make much more sense to the families and businesses built in these neighborhoods. It seems incredibly irresponsible, selfish, and immoral to cut through our homes, land, and businesses.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
400	4/20/2023	Courtney H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
401	2/22/2023	Courtney Parnick	Email	<p>Hello,            We live in the Heatherwood community off Lake Forest and less than a mile south of Bloomdale. Having the bypass come in is going to be loud and create more traffic. I understand the need to alleviate the traffic from 380 but you're not thinking about the communities. It's my understanding that there will be no sound barrier and our community (Bluewood Dr) will literally come out onto the frontage road. Why does it have to be so close to the current communities? You pushing it a little further north to accommodate a new water line is not going to be a big enough buffer. You're going to have cars coming off the frontage road at 70 mph onto Lake Forrest which is very dangerous. Also who will be maintaining the additional space between Heatherwood and the bypass? When families built their homes in Heatherwood there was a knowledge that eventually there would be a two land road north of the subdivision (like Eldorado or Virginia) and now you want to drop a bypass in our backyard. Thank you, Courtney</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. During TxDOT's US 380 Feasibility Study, which started in 2016 and concluded in 2020, TxDOT identified that moving the east-west portion of the US 380 bypass, currently named Segment E, further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands. Additionally, Erwin Park to the east and north of Bloomdale Road presents a hard constraint that TxDOT has worked to avoid throughout the project. Moving Segment E north by a half mile would impact Erwin Park. That said, TxDOT updated the design of Segment E, including moving it north to allow for the future waterline to create an 80-foot buffer between Heatherwood and the future freeway.</p> <p>TxDOT's evaluation shows the Heatherwood neighborhood currently has a brick privacy wall or barrier of some type that would reduce noise, therefore making the area unable to meet state and federal feasibility and reasonableness requirements.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p>
402	4/20/2023	Craig B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I do not approve of option A. There is much more open land to use with Option B, would be less disruptive and cost less.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
403	3/27/2023	Craig B Long	Email	<p>NO to Segment A            As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,            Craig B Long            McKinney TX 75072</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
404	4/20/2023	Craig C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A; Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
405	2/25/2023	Craig Hansen	Online	<p>I am writing in support of TxDOT's choice of Segment A for the Preferred Alternative (A+E+C). The enumerated reasons below are consistent with the TxDOT presentations and the comments in the DEIS.</p> <p>Choosing Segment A preserves the sanctity of ManeGait, and allows that organization to continue to serve the needs of constituents across the communities. As TxDOT noted on the Segment A Details slide, previous community comments showed substantial concern regarding any adverse impacts to ManeGait operations.</p> <p>Choosing Segment A acknowledges, and supports, the Prosper Thoroughfare Plan, which prescribes that US 380 be widened (as a LAR) along the existing route through town.</p> <p>The Segment A Details slide specifically stated the desire of TxDOT to utilize more of the existing 380 alignment.</p> <p>TxDOT acknowledges that Prosper has several residential developments underway in the path of Segment B. Section 3.20 points out that Segment B does not align with Prosper's planned roadway network.</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
406	4/20/2023	Craig J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The two 90 degree turns in option A will cause a major slowdown and distribution in traffic. Doesn't make sense. Option B is the logical route to go with.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
407	4/20/2023	Craig L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	TxDot 380 bypass. I oppose segment A, yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
408	2/24/2023	Craig Reavis	Email	<p>I wish to outline my reasons I am supporting Plan B for the US 380 EIS project.</p> <p>After attending the second TXDOT meeting I came back with a bad feeling about how the whole project has and is being decided. After reviewing the cost differences between plan A and plan B it is beyond me why TXDOT would chose plan A. It appears those who made these choices had no concern for the tax payers who will eventually pay for this project. Money that could be used for other projects would be wasted on saving a horse facility over choosing the wellbeing and life's work of families who will be totally torn apart. Many new and long existing businesses along Hwy 380 will be eliminated when Plan B would avoid closing these. The charts presented at the meeting are showing old and incorrect data that is used to justify these closings. The tax payers of Collin County be damned. The City of McKinney will be hurt financially harder than the City of Prosper. Most businesses that will be affected are in McKinney while open spaces in Prosper are not considered because of political pressure from that city. Again, these open spaces do not require businesses to be torn apart and families thrown out of their homes. The information provided from TXDOT states that there will be 22 residential homes and 35 businesses eliminated with plan A (these are numbers from old data and they are actually substantially higher than that). TXDOT tells us that these new routes will increase the possibilities of new commercial development along the new highway. And yet Prosper complains that this will stunt their growth. The large number of homes and businesses that are affected are located in McKinney, not Prosper. This proves that McKinney will bear the brunt of the financial burden. All of the above was made apparent when I attended the TXDOT meeting. But what really caught my attention as I walked among the displays was the people representing TXDOT were totally unprepared to answer even the simplest questions. The most common answer to my many questions was "I don't know". Even talking to a few of the people who should know the answers, the responses were the same and I was left totally unsatisfied with the presentations. I did discuss some concerns with the people at the Right Of Way table and found them to be very good at listening. But upon returning home and reviewing the literature that I was given, I now know that their presentation to me was a fairy tale. I know that my submission of this review will have little to no effect on the outcome of the 380 EIS Project. I have come to realize that anything I have concerns about are basically of no concern to those who make these decisions. The design, the choices, the planning have all been made and we, the tax payers of Collin County are left with little choice other than to realize that our voices are not important. The meeting was just fluff to justify political BS. I am a senior citizen of Collin County of 47 years. My home will be adversely affected to some degree. The only saving grace I can think of is that this project will outlive me and the results will be forced upon by those who outlive me and my family.</p> <p>Craig Reavis</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions. The numbers cited in the comment are not specific to Segments A or B instead they are for the entirety of the Blue Alternative from Coit Road to FM 1827, which includes Segments A, E, and C.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
409	4/20/2023	Cruz R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	yes Segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
410	3/16/2023	Crystal Bayley	Email	Dear TxDOT, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Crystal Bayley	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
411	2/25/2023	Crystal Collins	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Please consider the other option that doesn't disrupt our neighborhood that will be less than a mile from this. Thank you. Crystal Collins 1300 Goose Meadow Lane McKinney, Tx. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
412	2/6/2023	Crystal Miller	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
413	4/20/2023	Culbert P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
414	3/6/2023	Cynthia and George Ross	Comment Form	<p>As a resident of Tucker Hill for 13 years and with the pond and dog park across the alley from me, I and my husband are concerned about the noise and increased resident pollution. The following would ease the impact, we believe.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sound wall along 380 from Harvard building east to by-pass;</li> <li>2. Provide tree border and reasonable open space area along eastern portion of Tucker Hill;</li> <li>3. Create as many green grass/tree areas within building area - in neighborhoods, parks, By Pass "Camouflage,</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers. Vegetation such as trees, shrubs and grasses, though very natural and attractive in appearance, offer little reduction in noise levels. Therefore, it is not considered part of the project. However, for beautification purposes, TxDOT does offer green ribbon programs that cities can apply for during future phases of the project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>
415	4/20/2023	Cynthia B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
416	4/20/2023	Cynthia Bergman	Email	NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Cynthia Bergman 1604 La Cima Dr McKinney, TX 75071 Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
417	4/20/2023	Cynthia C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A and YES to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
418	4/20/2023	Cynthia D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This would be a huge impact to the community - not good. Don't turn this area into a freeway community...look at Los Angeles....NIGHTMARE.	Your comment is noted.
419	4/20/2023	Cynthia G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Concerned with pollution and noise level with turning north. I will be surrounded on two sides with large highway. I understand the need for 380 and being depressed helps with noise but a sound wall is needed for the new road/highway going North. I just can't grasp the impact on our families with this impact.	TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.
420	4/20/2023	Cynthia S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A -	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
421	2/21/2023	Cynthia Vanzant	Online	I believe any displacement is unacceptable. In my opinion is the best option would be to make 380 a highway and make all feeder roads larger thoroughfares. There is enough room to make 380 a highway so why is this not an option? Also I do not see this proposal as helping the traffic issue on 380. I only see maybe 10% of the present traffic using this new highway. I am opposed to all of the present options.	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. US 380 is currently a US highway. The Green Alternative, or Segment F, from Coit Road to FM 1827 (also referred to as "keeping 380 on 380" or expanding the existing US 380 to a freeway), was identified during the Feasibility Study, but ultimately was not carried forward for further analysis after because it would have displaced more than 30 residents and 200 businesses including Raytheon.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative (as well as all Build Alternatives) effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. You can find information about the traffic analysis conducted for the Blue Alternative in the DEIS. Please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.</p>
422	2/17/2023	D G	Online	<p>Option B should be THE option chosen and not option A because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The purpose of a bypass is to bypass the congested areas not slam into them.</li> <li>-Just because Prosper opposes doesn't mean it should be followed. Educate them that an outer loop can spur further growth.</li> <li>-The movement from westbound 380 arterial to westbound 380 frontage road/freeway will be backed up continuously, not everyone will take the freeway at multiple points in McKinney.</li> </ul>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative (as well as all Build Alternatives) effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. You can find information about the traffic analysis conducted for the Blue Alternative in the DEIS. Please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.
423	3/23/2023	D S	Online	<p>Dear Mr. Stephen Endres and those it concerns,</p> <p>I am a McKinney business owner and I SUPPORT SEGMENT A ONLY for the 380 bypass option. My family and I are in a unique position because we can see this from both McKinney and Prosper viewpoints and opinions. However, when reviewing the detailed information TXDOT has provided all citizens of both cities and after reviewing the DEIS, Segment A is 100% clearly the best and only option for everyone's futures. Let's use our collective common sense and stand with the DEIS study that clearly shows Segment A as the most viable option and put this issue to rest. I ask you to NOT punish the many because of a few! Citizens in every town and subdivision along the 380 corridors are upset and being pitted against one another because of this expansion project. Finalize Segment A as the final decision, close discussions and let's all move forward. Respectfully,</p> <p>Dream Street Developers, LLC.</p>	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
424	2/17/2023	Dale Bai num	Online	Ref: Section A - I think alternative route B should be chosen. The currently preferred route A leaves this section too narrow and doesn't support much future growth. It is still limited. The preferred option A requires people to travel farther on this narrow section until the bypass goes north at Ridge road. US380 is currently a mess and utilizing preferred option A continues several miles of the mess that can't be fixed. This will continue to be a bottleneck in the future even after the project is completed	<p>Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. By building a freeway, TxDOT is quadrupling the potential capacity of US 380 in order to handle future traffic. The proposed project would upgrade the current arterial with at-grade intersections to a freeway with frontage roads.</p> <p>TxDOT's analyses found that each build alternative, including the Preferred Alternative, is expected to attract traffic from arterial streets. Drivers taking long trips would likely take the freeway option because the mainlanes have no stop signs, they could drive at a higher rate of speed, and greatly reduce their travel times. You can find information about the traffic analysis conducted for the Blue Alternative in the DEIS. Please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.</p>
425	3/14/2023	Dale Hoenshell	Online	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas, I strongly support the Project 380 Segment B bypass alignment option. This option appears to reduce pressure on a larger portion of US 380 and be less disruptive having been adjusted to minimize existing developed or sensitive areas. My understanding, the current estimate is \$99 million less than Segment A. Segment B completely avoids a large interchange and overpasses for Stonebridge Drive and Custer Road along with associated water duct infrastructure and the long-term maintenance cost for future generations as they age. Segment B allows for less destruction and replacement of the existing 380 infrastructure investment. Segment B enables high future growth to move traffic flow safely, minimize air quality and other environmental impacts in already developed dense residential single and multi-family housing areas. It also appears to enable long term economic growth while splitting the disruption to a small area of Prosper and McKinney.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
426	4/3/2023	Dallas Taylor	Online	<p>The sound data for the noise study was taken between 11:26am-11:55a on Tue. Dec. 14, 2021 - while school was in session, at a stop light, during low traffic hours, while many were working from home during the pandemic. I've conducted real-world tests that are reflecting noise levels at similar locations 100-200%+ higher than what is estimated by 2050. (under current conditions.) I've proven this here: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-YwQ9dAce4o">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-YwQ9dAce4o</a>. Tucker Hill needs more noise mitigation to get the decibel level under 67db. (longer depression, sound wall on the south side, cantilever-style access roads.) No study has been done on the east side of the neighborhood and the effects of highway noise from multiple directions. Nor have there been studies done on the construction noise and side street noise which will be pushed into our neighborhood with all traffic flowing on it during construction. The measurement used by TxDOT is outdated (last updated in 2001) and has known unreliability</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. The traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines. Sound levels were forecasted utilizing the required Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) computer program, Traffic Noise Model 2.5 (TNM). Input for the model is comprised of the roadway, traffic counts, elevation and other topographic features. Its accuracy is contingent upon computed sound levels that are within 3dB of those measured adjacent to the project. These field measurements are used for validating TNM and not for noise analysis for the present-day or future environment. The validated TNM was utilized to compute sound levels for two scenarios, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- existing – representing present-day acoustic environment;</li> <li>- future build condition – representing design year acoustic environment if project is constructed.</li> </ul> <p>TxDOT's Traffic Noise Policy Implementation Guidance states "Input data for traffic noise modeling such as traffic volumes, traffic speed, and vehicle mix must represent the traffic characteristics that yield the loudest hourly traffic noise levels on a regular basis under normal conditions. Note that in heavily congested urban corridors, the peak traffic period may not represent the worst noise conditions, since speeds may be lower and heavy truck volumes may drop as truckers try to avoid congestion."</p> <p>Input for each scenario consisted of worst-case traffic projections provided by TxDOT.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
427	3/31/2023	Dallas Taylor	Email	<p>On the behalf of the residents of Tucker Hill, we are writing to request an additional extension of time to submit comments for the EIS. The noise study is based on fundamentally flawed data &amp; estimates. It needs to be retested entirely including real-world tests in similar locations around DFW. Here are a few (but not complete):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sound data that the entire noise study is based on was taken between 11:26am-11:55a a Tuesday, December 14, 2021. This was a week before school was out, at a stop light on 380, during very low traffic hours, while many people were still working from home during the pandemic. Anyone with an SPL meter at peak hours can see these noise levels are upwards of 100% (10db) louder than what was tested.</li> <li>• I've conducted and am continuing to conduct real-world tests that are reflecting noise levels at similar locations 100-200%+ higher than what is estimated by 2050. (current conditions!) Well above the legal limit of 67db for residential. I've proven this in this video. I plan on visiting other locations in DFW to corroborate this.</li> <li>• Outside of the depression, there are no other noise mitigations in the designs.</li> <li>• Even with every mitigation strategy possible (deep depression, cantilever side roads, sound walls, lowering the east side to ground level) it will be very difficult to get noise levels to 67db or below for the south side of the neighborhood. We may need a tunnel to mitigate this properly.</li> <li>• There has been no study done for the east side of the neighborhood and the effects of highway noise from multiple directions. Nor have there been studies done on the construction noise, and side street noise which will be pushed into our neighborhood with all traffic flowing on it during construction.</li> <li>• The measurement technique used by TxDOT is outdated (last updated in 2001) and has known unreliability.</li> </ul> <p>The residents of Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch's long-term health and well-being are at stake. Noise is a major contributor to many health problems. We also need to meet with TxDOT to work together to present our findings and work on solutions together. At the moment, we're not getting any feedback, which is deeply concerning. We've been presented with an enormous amount of data with very little time to organize, test, and understand. We respectfully ask for an extension to the deadline and meetings with TxDOT and acousticians to remedy the major noise issues that are inevitable.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines. Sound levels were forecasted utilizing the required Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) computer program, Traffic Noise Model 2.5 (TNM). Input for the model is comprised of the roadway, traffic counts, elevation and other topographic features. Its accuracy is contingent upon computed sound levels that are within 3dB of those measured adjacent to the project. These field measurements are used for validating TNM and not for noise analysis for the present-day or future environment. The validated TNM was utilized to compute sound levels for two scenarios, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- existing – representing present-day acoustic environment;</li> <li>- future build condition – representing design year acoustic environment if project is constructed.</li> </ul> <p>TxDOT's Traffic Noise Policy Implementation Guidance states "Input data for traffic noise modeling such as traffic volumes, traffic speed, and vehicle mix must represent the traffic characteristics that yield the loudest hourly traffic noise levels on a regular basis under normal conditions. Note that in heavily congested urban corridors, the peak traffic period may not represent the worst noise conditions, since speeds may be lower and heavy truck volumes may drop as truckers try to avoid congestion."</p> <p>Input for each scenario consisted of worst-case traffic projections provided by TxDOT.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p> <p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
428	3/7/2023	Dallas Taylor	Email	Hi Stephen, I was watching the kiddos while my wife attended the Public Hearing on the 380 Bypass. She spoke with one of the Acousticians but didn't catch his name. All she knew is that he also used to live in Maryland like us. I'm an expert in sound myself and have a few clarifying questions about the noise data. Can you provide me with the contact info of the acoustician so I can reach out?	March 9, 2023 reply:  Good Morning Mr. Taylor,  It was a pleasure meeting your wife at the US 380 Public Hearing and for us to provide information regarding the TxDOT noise study. I understand that you have a few clarifying questions concerning the traffic noise analysis. Would you be able to please submit these questions or comments through the website at PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT FORM (arcgis.com)?
429	3/16/2023	Damian Mobley	Email	Hi Stephen - As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Damian Mobley 940-218-0324	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
430	4/18/2023	Damon Villar	Email	Whom it may concern, See attached document... Tucker Hill is a front-porch community by design and given the amount of time spent outside and in our community, I am concerned about air quality and noise and do not feel they were adequately addressed nor were our facilities and neighborhood type properly identified in the study. Has TxDOT studied the full impact of air quality during and after construction? If so, where were the air quality monitors located for the current study? I am concerned about safety during construction and beyond and do not feel the study adequately addressed safety and access to our neighborhood during and after construction. How will emergency response time be affected during the construction period? What will happen with overflow parking at Harvard Park into Tucker Hill when you take a row of parking?  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	The current design shows that TxDOT would likely need to acquire the land where the last row of parking is for the Harvard Park parking lot. TxDOT does not anticipate that additional right-of-way beyond what is described in the DEIS will be needed for the project. If the property owner chooses to reconfigure parking due to the TxDOT ROW acquisition, they would have to do so on their own property. During the TxDOT ROW acquisition process, TxDOT hires a third party to appraise and assess any potential damage and if the building can still operate with its original purpose.  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
431	2/18/2023	Dan and Amber Block	Email	<p>Hi Stephen,            Thank you for hosting the 380 Bypass Open House last Thursday, Feb. 15, 2023. I was able to have meaningful conversations with several of the Engineers on site and they encouraged me to include the following notes in my Public Hearing Comment email. My wife and I live at 2548 FM 2933, McKinney (Site/Lot 417). Thank you in advance for taking the time to read these comments, and for considering their importance to my family, our neighborhood, and the greater McKinney Community.</p> <p>1. Horse Operation            a. Eventing (Dressage, Stadium &amp; Cross-Country Jumping)            i. We own a house on ~1 acre that separates a 5 acre front pasture from a 5 acre back pasture, each with different properties conducive to on-site horse training.</p> <p>1. The front pasture is flat and free of trees (except for three Pecan trees we planted for future shade) which allows us to operate a riding arena necessary for my wife (and fellow competitors) to train for the Dressage and Stadium Jumping portions of their Eventing Competitions.            2. The back pasture is dominated by a large dome rock outcrop, and is dotted with trees, both providing natural impediments typical of the Cross-Country Jumping portion of the Eventing Competitions.            3. In NTX the dominant horse country is near Aubrey and Pilot Point, north of McKinney. Eventers in these areas have lots of options for training facilities. East of McKinney there are fewer spaces, and for those who live in this area our place has become a community asset which supports an important and vibrant part of Collin County.</p> <p>b. Horse Therapy            i. My wife mentors a young girl who struggles with anxiety and depression. For the past 5 years she has been coming to our place to decompress and work on body mechanics. She loves the horses and lights up when riding in the sand arena, a place she feels safe due to the soft and smooth footing.</p> <p>Route C as planned would go right through our riding arena and take up 3/5ths of our front 5 acres, eliminating our "safe place" for horse therapy, and the training ground for 2/3rds of the Eventing Competitions. For this reason we ask that you reject Route C and support ROUTE D.</p> <p>2. Agriculture Operation            a. The separation of the front and back pastures is vital for our horses and donkey (currently we have 3 horses, but have owned 4), as we either split them into two groups (front &amp; back), or rotate them all between each pasture, depending on the season. Texas summers are not conducive to strong hay growth so we keep them out of the front pasture during spring in order to cut one crop of hay (flat, good soil, relatively free of trees). During this time the horses effectively drain the grass resources in the back pasture where the rock outcrop and thinner soil limits grass density. After our hay harvest we rotate them between each pasture as the front begins to produce a bit before the Texas heat burns it all off. After this, and for much of the summer we must supplement with hay.</p> <p>Route C as planned would eliminate 3/5ths of our front pasture and</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>prevent us from harvesting enough hay to either sell (for our Ag Tax Exemption) or use to supplement our horses feed in the heat of the summer. The back pasture CAN NOT sustain our horses on its own, and so if Route C is chosen we will be unable to economically/sufficiently feed our horses, nor maintain our Ag Exemption. For this reason we ask that you reject Route C and support ROUTE D. Final Note: Please consider altering Route C so that it traverses the western side of FM 2933 near our house instead of the eastern side. The western side is owned by one family who do not have a dwelling on the property. It would be a simpler ROW process and would not interrupt the livelihoods of me and my four neighbors. I get it that destroying 5 families does not seem like a large inconvenience given the scope of the 380 Bypass project, but for us it is VITAL, and the solution to run along the western side of the road seems doable. Our Horse and Agriculture Operations are at stake and our place rendered useless if Route C goes right through our front pasture.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration,            Dan and Amber Block            214-471-3331</p>	
432	3/9/2023	Dan and Jeanette Madsen	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.</p>
433	4/20/2023	Dan Tobin	Online	<p>The property owner at 7200 West University Drive in McKinney strongly opposes the current proposed alignment. This property is improved with a 40,000 SF mixed-use development, which won the City of McKinney's development award in 2019. This alignment threatens the sustainability of the building and risks it being functionally obsolete. There are many negative consequences of that happening, including an empty building that blights the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The current design shows TxDOT would need to acquire the land where the row of parking is closest to the existing US 380. TxDOT does not anticipate that additional right-of-way beyond what is described in the DEIS will be needed for the project. If the property owner chooses to reconfigure parking due to the TxDOT ROW acquisition, they would have to do so on their own property. During the TxDOT ROW acquisition process, TxDOT will hire a third-party independent appraiser to determine the value of the property in accordance with state law. If the appraisal process indicates that the remaining property will have a lesser value after the project is constructed, the property owner will be offered an amount for damages to be included in the total offer made by TxDOT.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
434	4/20/2023	Dan W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The impact of Segment A will have a direct impact on my family safety and health along with negative impact to housing prices to Tucker Hill. Segment B is cheaper and a smarter alternative taking in consideration of existing homeowners over developers.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
435	3/15/2023	Dani Phillips	Email	Stephen, I oppose segment A of the bypass project. We live very close to the pond on Stonebridge drive/380/Watch Hill Lane. As I drive around the suburbs of north texas, I don't see a neighborhood as close as ours to a bypass. Our children in our neighborhood can walk all around the area including crossing stonebridge and to the local parks and restaurants. A bypass at our neighborhood will severely change our neighborhood. Furthermore, the proposed bypass would be done right around the time our kids will start driving down 380 to get to high school. A drive that takes less than 10 minutes needs a highway? Even if traffic increases and it takes 25 minutes that is not a big deal and much safer on surface roads than people speeding along a freeway. Colt road/segment B is a much better option for a segment if you just push ahead with the project, there are not neighborhoods as close to 380 at that intersection. Thank you. Dani	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. One of several examples of neighborhoods near freeways in North Texas are the Vista of Coppell and Westhaven neighborhoods directly adjacent to SH 121 in Coppell. These neighborhoods would actually be closer to the freeway frontage roads than what is being proposed near Stonebridge Ranch and the future US 380. Other examples would include neighborhoods at SH 121 and SRT as well as Valley Ranch and Las Colinas.  The purpose of this project is to manage congestion, improve east-west regional mobility, and improve safety.  There are neighborhoods adjacent to both Segments A and B.
436	4/20/2023	Daniel A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to B.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
437	4/20/2023	Daniel K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A. Why would the TxDOT even consider theSegment A which cost more, Increases the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy more businesses and homes, and result in more overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney?	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
438	3/20/2023	Daniel Konieczny	Online	Dear Mr. Endres, As a resident of the Tucker Hill community, I am very concerned that the TxDOT is considering Segment A for the 380 proposed route. It is my understanding that this is the more expansion route option that would adversely impact more businesses and residents than the alternative Segment B. Segment A would also have a greater tax burden for the McKinney community. Segment B is the best option which reduces costs, has the smallest impacts. Regards, Daniel Konieczny	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
439	2/17/2023	Daniel L.	Online	I strongly support the original diverging diamond interchange (DDI) schematic for the Custer Rd and future US380 interchange. While the proposed design change reduces ROW impacts, the high throughput of the DDI will "future proof" this intersection. Custer Rd serves as a major North-South travel corridor for those in between US-75 and Preston Rd. I work in McKinney (commuting from further South) and Custer Rd is a very useful option for North-South travel. Having driven through DDIs elsewhere in Texas, I am a firm believer in their use for allowing high throughput on the cross street. With the nearest traffic light a half mile to the South, this should be the ideal location for a DDI. Keeping the original schematic for the DDI may greatly relieve future strain on what likely will be a busy interchange between Custer Rd and the proposed US380. Thank you for your consideration.	Your comment and support for the DDI interchange at Custer Road and the future US 380 is noted.
440	3/8/2023	Daniel Owens	Email	Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on Mckinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout Mckinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Rd to FM 1827. Sincerely, Daniel Owens	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
441	2/22/2023	Daniel Stockman	Online	My family is in favor of the approved route A	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
442	3/15/2023	Daniel Western	Email	<p>Dear Mr Endres,</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for the proposed expansion of US Highway 380 in Texas, as outlined in the US 380 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) available on the Keep It Moving Dallas website. I am in agreement with the proposed Segments A, E and C. I strongly disagree with segment B as being an option.</p> <p>As a frequent passer-by of these routes, I have experienced firsthand the traffic congestion and delays during peak hours, which greatly affect my daily commute and overall quality of life. I believe that the proposed expansion will not only improve traffic flow and reduce congestion but also promote economic growth in the region, which will benefit the community as a whole. I appreciate the efforts of the project team in conducting a thorough analysis of the potential impacts of the expansion and providing opportunities for public involvement and feedback. I have reviewed the project summary, benefits, and potential impacts on the Keep It Moving Dallas website, and I am confident that the proposed route is the best option for the long-term sustainability and development of the region.</p> <p>Therefore, I fully support the proposed expansion of US Highway 380 and urge the project team to move forward with its implementation as soon as possible. Thank you for your consideration and commitment to improving transportation in our community. Sincerely,</p> <p>Daniel Western Whitley Place Home Owner Prosper Texas E: [REDACTED]</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
443	4/20/2023	Danielle K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, YES to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
444	2/26/2023	Danielle Kazmierczak	Online	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
445	3/7/2023	Danny App	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
446	2/6/2023	Danny C. Nickason	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
447	4/20/2023	Danny S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Our family has serious concerns with the excessive noise and pollution that will severely impact us and our neighborhood during both the extensive construction phase of Segment A and the traffic that will be using the completed roadway. The construction of the 380 route will severely impact not just our home values but potentially our health as well. Routing to Segment B is not a perfect plan but will greatly minimize the disruption of people's homes and lives but also local businesses along the Segment A route. Please consider the hundreds of homes, businesses and families that will be impacted by the Segment A route and adjust to Segment B as that is a more cost effective plan and minimizes the potential life altering destruction of our Tucker Hill community and adjacent neighborhoods as well.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
448	3/15/2023	Darci Tolbert	Email	<p>Hello:          We live at 4290 Bellingrath Drive in Prosper, at Whitley Place. Please consider the residents of Whitley Place regarding the bypass. Most of us have invested a significant amount in the area and are very involved in the community, schools, etc. Please keep the bypass away from Whitley Place Subdivision. Appreciate all your efforts and your work in Texas. Thank you,          Darci Tolbert          Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper.
449	2/25/2023	Darelle Walsh	Email	<p>Comment: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B          Dear Mr. Endres,          As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I just don't understand how a proposition that has been thoroughly argued against, destroys a ton of wild life habitats, as well as small businesses and disrupts homes could be picked as the best option. As an educated thinker it does not make any sense and makes me wonder if this was a political decision instead of a decision that has been researched to find the best course of action. Again, as a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.          Darelle Walsh</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
450	2/24/2023	Darlene and Steve Simmons	Email	Hello As a homeowner in Stonebridge, I strongly oppose option A! Pls go for B. Sincerely Darlene/ Steve Simmons Cascades-Stonebridge McKinney , Tx	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
451	4/20/2023	Darrel C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	It is inconceivable to me that the current choice for the 380 Loop stands up to any logical scrutiny. \$200m more in cost and vastly more impactful to existing developed uses. Please reconsider the route being mindful of all the cost financial and otherwise.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
452	2/19/2023	Darren Brereton	Email	I am sending this email to oppose route C and support route D when discussing the Spur 399 Extension. Route D would impact fewer people and would allow the continued community use of the Mitchel Block riding arena. This space is used for therapeutic horse riding along with community get togethers.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
453	2/21/2023	Darren Clark	Comment Form	<p>Completely opposed to route "C". Why were 2 yr old maps used for mapping out section C? Seems you have calculated costs without taking into account the sewer lines being laid right now - surely this adds more cost and makes "D" the better plan. "C" affects so many more residences + businesses including a personal friends farm land. This route is strongly opposed by Texas Parks &amp; Wildlife as they know D disturbs much less wetlands + species habitats.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. Aerial maps show on the schematic design roll plots were created when the team conducted detailed aerial surveys at the beginning of the project. The corridor was flown to capture and create high-resolution models of ground elevation and topographic information.</p> <p>Major utilities that will be impacted by the project are accounted for in the evaluation matrix. Not all the utilities along the corridor will be impacted.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. It outlines that for an EIS project, TxDOT is supposed to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things that TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
454	3/31/2023	Darryl Jackson	Online	<p>I'm opposed to segment A because it is more expensive, it will bring more traffic noise to my neighborhood, and I think the bypass should start further west. I think diverting traffic as far west as possible due to all the businesses and neighborhoods along US 380 from Custer to 75 would alleviate traffic congestion along this stretch sooner. I support segment B of the options that are given.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
455	2/25/2023	Dave and Stephanie Johnson	Online	<p>Comments on 380 Expansion                      Dave and Stephanie Johnson                      7505 Wescott Lane McKinney, TX 75071                      Tucker Hill Subdivision                      First, we are convinced that Option B continues to be the better option for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Option B is cheaper and displaces fewer businesses.</li> <li>● The overall driving distance for Option B is shorter, thereby reducing travel time and pollution for the entire area.</li> <li>● Tucker Hill is unique in North Texas, with homes specifically designed for residents to spend a lot of their time outside on their front porches, enjoying life with neighbors. Since Option A cuts very close to our homes at the front of our neighborhood (just one lot length away from some of our neighbors' garages), and now cuts north very close to our east side, the serenity and beauty of our neighborhood will be severely impacted. If TxDOT goes forward with the Blue Alternative, damage to the neighborhood can be mitigated by two things:</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A sound barrier wall should be placed on the north side of 380 in front of Tucker Hill (as already planned for the south side); that is absolutely essential.</li> <li>2. A major concern for Tucker Hill is entering and exiting the neighborhood during construction. We require one or the other of the following:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. TxDOT must guarantee that both of our only entrances will be kept open at the front of our development during construction. It will be a safety hazard if there is an emergency and for some reason, the one and only exit from the community becomes blocked.</li> <li>b. If TxDOT cannot guarantee this, NO construction in front of Tucker Hill can begin until Stonebridge Drive has been expanded north of 380 and west of Tucker Hill. (The developer has planned since Tucker Hill's inception to have a west entrance/exit from an expanded Stonebridge Drive.)</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will also develop a detailed traffic control plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with stakeholders and residents through final design to minimize impacts to residences and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p>
456	4/20/2023	Dave J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>A decision of this magnitude should consider the increased construction disruption to residents, which is by far more significant with option A. In addition, the KNOWN costs point to selecting option B. Speculation regarding future development that may occur in the path of segment B serves as a shallow criterion for decision-making. Properties can be zoned and rezoned at the will of a given town or city.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
457	3/15/2023	Dave Verrelli	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>In response to the Subject Decision, I want to thank the Team for a thorough and extensive review of the Options and selection of the Blue Alternative. At this point in time, no decision is going to be 100% accepted by the residents of Collin County since the obvious and most direct route decision was taken off the Board last year. "Keep 380 on 380". Clearly, the businesses along 380 were built in their locations because of the drive by customers that would see their storefronts and stop in. Taking the By Pass traffic away from these businesses isn't going to be embraced by the local store owners. As a previous resident of McKinney and a current resident of Prosper, I have a unique perspective of the two competing positions. But in the long run since McKinney didn't plan accordingly along 380 by allowing residential communities and businesses to build too close to 380, it only makes sense that any displacements caused by the Blue Alternative impact McKinney not Prosper residents and businesses. My only Comment/Question is, "Did the Team ever consider building a roadway under 380 similar to the expansion of I-635 in Dallas to move the McKinney ByPass traffic between Coit and FM 1827? This option would only need the main lanes of transportation as the two frontage lanes each way would be handled by the existing lanes of 380 and thus the Project wouldn't need the full width of 10 lanes each 12 ft wide of roadway. Growing up in the Washington DC area, I witnessed the Metro being built and drove across many a metal plate until the underground construction was completed. It can be done. Again, Thanks for your hard work and Good Luck publishing the FEIS.</p> <p>Dave Verrelli 741 Butchart Drive Prosper, TX 75078</p>	Your comment and support of the Blue Alternative is noted. There are select sections of the freeway that will be depressed including Segment A in between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods. It is important to note that the right-of-way width needed for a freeway would not differ significantly regardless if the freeway was above, below, or at-grade. Therefore, there would still be a large number of residential and business displacements (including Raytheon) along the existing US 380 in McKinney. Above and below grade freeways are also more expensive to construct as well as TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove existing elevated freeways in several locations across the state.
458	2/17/2023	David Bruce	Online	I am opposed to the C route. Under no circumstances would I support the C route unless there is a change or compromise that would move the beginning of the C to move to the D route. Start it out on the East side of the airport but then move it half mile to mile down to the D route.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
459	4/20/2023	David & Sara L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option A is the wrong decision	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
460	3/16/2023	David A. Frank	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				Sincerely, David A. Frank	
461	2/17/2023	David Adams	Online	Please keep 380 on 380. No need to ruin existing establishments.	Your comment is noted.
462	4/20/2023	David and Eileen Kaeser	Email	<p>Stephen, My wife and I live in Tucker Hill and we are extremely concerned over what seems to be, a lack of consideration for the needs of our community here in Tucker Hill. We bought in this neighborhood 4 ½ years ago where, the attraction is the enormous amounts of character and peacefulness this community holds. Reviewing the plans, we have so many concerns. My 1st concern is air quality and noise. It doesn't look like the studies properly address these issues to a satisfactory level. We have a pool and clubhouse literally feet from the proposed route. We're not sure where these air-quality studies took place but I can't imagine these were taken so close to where groups of people including children gather outdoors, not to mention the noise.</p> <p>Next, is safety in/out of our development during construction. We only have 2 ways of getting in and out of this development. Have there been any studies on how this will affect the traffic flow especially if emergency vehicles need to enter quickly?</p> <p>We truly believe Tucker Hill has been unduly and unfairly impacted by many of these "studies" to push along a pre-determined agenda. Looking at all the facts, Segment A costs \$150 million more than Segment B, Segment A affects more homes and businesses than B and Segment A affects more of the streams and wetlands, making this a more environmentally unfriendly choice. Can you explain in a simplistic manner to me, how any of this makes sense?</p> <p>Please respond. Thank you. David and Eileen Kaeser (214) 620-5663 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences.</p> <p>The pool referenced in the comment appears to be more than 350 feet away from the proposed right-of-way and the shared use path. The Harvard business park is also between the proposed roadway and the pool/clubhouse.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 -- 2026 TIP. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. The location along study segments with the highest traffic counts (ETC and Design years) were used as the locations for receptors. The receptors are illustrated in Appendix P, CO TAQA Technical Report, Attachment A, Exhibit 3.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>
463	2/26/2023	David and Elaine Ewing	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,  NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B  As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Our opposition to Segment A of the "Blue Alternative" is based on the following facts presented by TxDOT in their February 2023 Announcement:  1. Segment A destroys 27 businesses, 12 displacements and 2 homes currently. It will likely be more than that by the time the project is constructed whereas Segment B destroys no business, 7 displacements, and 5 homes.  2. The cost of Segment A right of way acquisition estimated today is \$957.8 million compared to \$888.8 million for Segment B. It is likely to reach more than \$1 billion by the time the project is constructed based on current construction projects which are not counted in the current TxDOT estimates.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Right-of-way acquisition estimates were calculated using Collin County Appraisal District as a guide to come up with square footage cost. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>3. The proposed Blue Alternative which includes Segment A calls for \$120 million from the City of McKinney for right of way acquisition which will be an unplanned tax burden to McKinney taxpayers. The amount of that tax burden quite likely will increase as the cost of ROW acquisitions and related expenses increase.</p> <p>4. Segment A will have a significant detrimental impact on Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill which border the proposed construction of Segment A. It will create major traffic disruption, increased noise, and increased health and environmental problems, not to mention the impact on schools, morning and afternoon traffic, and school zones divided by US380 Segment A. Thank you, David &amp; Elaine Ewing 700 Braxton Court McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,</li> <li>-depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and</li> <li>-providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</li> </ul>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
464	4/4/2023	David and Pam Sylvester	Email	<p>My wife and I are 10-year residents of Tucker Hill and we feel that Option B is the ideal solution as it has the hallmark of "Less Is More" which makes it the most "Ethical" of choices. A solid business ethic is the result of good people expressing wisdom and high purpose while making decisions that result in less harm to its citizens and the environment, all for the ultimate good of the community. Tucker Hill is fortunate to have sincere ethical leaders who have been consistently engaged and focused on obtaining a result that achieves the least harm and the "ultimate good" for Tucker Hill and the local community as a whole.</p> <p>Option B fulfills this:  Option B is less costly.  Option B has less business impact.  Option B has low home displacement.  Option B provides a more direct and expedient route and will be safer.  Option B has far less environmental impact.  Option B provides less disruption to Collin College and Baylor Hospital.  Option B benefits are many, detailed and support "Less is More".</p> <p>Truly Option B is the most ethical, cost effective and beneficial - providing the least harm to its citizens and environment - all for the "ultimate good" of the community.</p> <p>Most Sincerely, David and Pam Sylvester - Tucker Hill  April 2, 2020</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
465	2/6/2023	David Bruce	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
466	4/20/2023	David C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to B. No to A. Do the right thing for the thousands of residents, not the few individuals with a certain vested financial interest.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
467	4/20/2023	David Carmichael	Email (2)	<p>To whom it may concern,  My wife and I live at 7709 Townsend Blvd in the Tucker Hill community of McKinney. I have been involved with working on keeping our community safe and out of the path of the 380 Bypass from the beginning. We helped push for the Segment B option, and it was looking as if TxDOT would choose that route, at least in 2022 but money, power, and politics always win against the small Taxpaying Homeowners. So here we are with TxDOT choosing Segment A and spending over 200 million more of our money on an option that makes no sense, has a dangerous 90-degree turn, takes out our only entrance, encroaches on more wetlands, affects more streams and rivers, and gives preferential treatment to a horse ranch and their visitors over homeowners who live in the affect area daily. It appears irrefutable that Segment B is the better alternative and that there are serious flaws in the conclusions reached by TxDOT and in the underlying Environmental Impact Study (EIS). Why are Segment decisions made with inconsistencies ? We were told the comments are a small part of the decision, while those in Segment B were told that the decision was made because more comments came in against B. Why was the traffic study done during the 2020 pandemic when no one was driving to work, so that the noise and air pollution did not show accurate levels? Why was one mph shown as the normal wind speed in the study? Why did TxDOT tell our elected officials that there was nothing they could do to influence the decision but tell those impacted to go to their elected officials to push them to influence the alignment choices? Why does it appear that more intense study was done to the affects of a bypass to ManeGate than to Tucker Hill, as our parks, pool, clubhouse etc. were not identified so no impact studies were done? Is TxDOT pushing the Bypass thru to gain federal funding while available, without doing their due diligence to study the full effects to the Homeowners and businesses involved? What is the plan for emergency services, school busses and individuals to enter and exit the Tucker Hill community during construction? If the City of McKinney cannot come up with the money to move utilities where will this money come from? Will or can Segment A shift closer to Tucker Hill, without study to affects of the shift? How do paid lobbyist effect the decision making process? We have seen that money and influence obviously have effects. Please do not proceed with this project without a rigorous study of all pollutants that cause harm to humans and a rigorous health impact analysis to understand both current and future impacts. If TxDOT will not mitigate these harms, then TxDOT should at the very least do a rigorous analysis of these harms and explicitly note the opportunities we for go with the current preferred alignment. See attached document outlining all the inconsistencies we have found int the EIS study, also the areas we believe need more study to see the actual impacts to out neighborhood as well as</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B is noted.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>the other affected by Segment A. Thank you, David Carmichael</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	
468	3/7/2023	David Chapman	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>David Chapman [REDACTED]</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
469	3/9/2023	David Coggiola	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
470	4/20/2023	David D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>This expansion of 380 would destroy our neighborhood and effect our hearing</p>	Your comment is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
471	2/6/2023	David Deeds	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
472	4/20/2023	David F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Choose the \$150M cheaper option to taxpayers.	Your comment is noted.
473	2/17/2023	David Farmer	Email	Hello. My name is David Farmer and I would like to voice my opposition to the 380 bypass (route C). The bypass would destroy the property owned by a good friend. This property serves as a place for therapeutic horse riding, community rides, events, and church services. The bypass would go directly through the riding arena and honey bee area on the property, and the noise from the highway would be incredibly detrimental to the animals. I would instead like to voice support of route D. It crosses through the flood plain, and would only disrupt 7 homes instead of 29. Thank you for listening, and I hope you will consider the impact of route D on the people and animals that call the area home. Thank you, David Farmer 830-876-8096	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.
474	4/20/2023	David G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
475	1/20/2023	David Greene	E-mail	Stephen, I live in McKinney along 380 and have scanned the DEIS links. What is the timeline to start and complete this project? David Greene 7400 Stanhope Street McKinney	Your comment is noted. The conceptual timeline shared at the Public Hearing indicates that a Record of Decision for the EIS is anticipated to be issued in the fall of 2023. The next phase of project development is final design, ROW acquisition, and utilities coordination. This phase is estimated to take 2-4 years, putting the Ready to Let date sometime in 2027. Currently this project is not fully funded. Phased construction can only begin once full project funding is identified and secured for US 380.  This anticipated timeline is subject to change pending coordination, public involvement, technical analysis, and identification of funding.
476	4/20/2023	David H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The purpose of this project is to help relieve congestion on an already heavily used roadway, correct? Yet, segment A of the preferred option, has the higher impact to motorists over segment B while construction will be underway, causing more congestion and headache to those that use it on a daily basis. No to segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
477	4/20/2023	David H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am a senior citizen living in the area that would be drastically affected if Route A was selected, by Environmental issues and the inability to obtain immediate medical attention. I requested Route B be selected for the care of my family. Please do not block us in.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.  According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p>
478	3/16/2023	David Harap	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
479	3/13/2023	David Hedgpeth	Email	<p>I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. David Hedgpeth CFS/CDS/ASC, Principal Hill Country Transportation Resources, LLC Litigation Support 2005 Tremont Blvd McKinney, Texas 75071 214-843-6689 [REDACTED]</p> <p>This email is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and delete the original message.</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
480	3/16/2023	David Hughey	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, David Hughey</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
481	4/20/2023	David J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, Yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
482	4/19/2023	David Johnson	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,            Having further reviewed the proposed Segment A impact to myself and my neighbors during the extended comment period, I have found substantial new points of discussion as well as questions that should be answered. These are in addition to my earlier submitted comments. Both my wife and I are elderly as are 75% of the people on my street which is located very near the proposed extended 380. Even closer than us to the proposed extension are other neighbors in the same demographic. Not surprisingly, this population is already experiencing numerous health issues. Moreover, many children reside in close proximity to the proposed construction. In my opinion, TxDOT's study fails to address the increased noise, adverse mental health effects, and significant air pollution that will accompany the widening of 380 and which will be deleterious to the people who live here. Even for those who are young and healthy, the fact that Tucker Hill is a "front porch community" with many outdoor facilities and events has been overlooked by the study. Also concerning to me is the lack of study applied to safety issues during and after the construction process. My safety concerns include having sufficient neighborhood access for both residents and emergency personnel. The safety of having two 90 degree turns in the freeway has likewise not been properly considered when compared to the alternative.</p> <p>Questions that I need to have addressed include the following:</p> <p>3. Beyond depressing the fast lanes that pass in front of Tucker Hill, how will TxDOT further reduce the unacceptable noise level that is going to accompany the new roadway (unacceptable considering the neighborhood demographic and lifestyle)?</p> <p>8. What does adding a sound wall, in addition to the depression, do to mitigate the unreasonable levels of noise?</p> <p>13. What is TxDOT planning to do to add back additional parking for the Harvard building which is currently slated to lose an entire row of spaces (and this will lead to the already limited resident-only Residents' Club parking being inappropriately used by those who don't live here)?</p> <p>18. What would implementing a cantilevered approach in front of the Harvard building do in terms of both space and noise reduction (helping to address concerns raised in the previous two questions)?</p> <p>23. What would a combined depression, sound wall, and cantilevered approach do in terms of space and noise reduction?</p> <p>28. How will emergency response services be affected during the period of construction?</p> <p>32. When is TxDOT going to complete and publish a vibration analysis that identifies impact to homes near the construction area (homes that can already rumble when a large truck passes by), or if already published,</p>	<p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>where are the results of the analysis?                      37. What is the full impact of increased air pollution as a result of the widening (both before and after construction)?                      42. Where were monitors for air quality installed for the current study?                      46. What is the effect of air pollution on the neighborhood when CURRENT traffic studies are considered on both the SOUTH and EAST sides?                      51. What is the effect of noise on the neighborhood when an UPGRADED monitoring package is used along with CURRENT measurements during PEAK periods of traffic on BOTH the SOUTH and EAST sides?                      56. Where is the complete analysis of safety impacts due to the sharper turns involved in segment A versus segment B?                      61. Where is TxDOT's study of the aesthetic impacts that 380 widening will cause?                      65. Where can we obtain a copy of the study that explains everything in language which a non-technical person is able to understand?                      70. What assurances is TxDOT providing that no further western shifts of the "first curve" of 380 (already UNACCEPTABLE!!!) will take place?                      75. What will TxDOT do to lower the elevation of the eastern bypass portion that heads to the north?                      79. What engineering possibilities exist for TxDOT to erect a sound wall on the eastern bypass portion that heads to the north?</p> <p>Besides the concerns and questions raised above, please note MY OFFICIAL AGREEMENT with the research below which spells out many other deficiencies regarding TxDOT's position.                      Regards,                      Dave Johnson                      7505 Wescott Ln                      McKinney, TX 75071</p> <p>***** Research Notes</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
483	4/20/2023	David K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	It is very clear that the Segment A route would be much more destructive to current businesses and more disruptive to homeowners - and to traffic flow. Has TXDOT done any traffic flow modeling to determine which route would work better - realizing the amount of traffic \"back up\" at the stop lights on A vs B segments??	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix.</p>
484	4/19/2023	David Keese	Online	<p>Please see the attached letter. Dear Mr. Endres: I write this letter as a Collin County, Texas resident due to my concerns that the selection of Segment A for the 380 bypass will negatively impact significantly more Collin County residents and businesses than Segment B, as well as result in a significantly higher costs than Segment B. Texas Department of Transportation has provided several justifications for the preliminary selection of Segment A, however, the factors in favor of Segment B significantly outweigh the factors supporting Segment A.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
485	2/25/2023	David Miller	Online	Option B is less expensive and safer than Option A. TXDOT should reconsider and implement Segment B.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
486	3/28/2023	David Norton	Email	I vote NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, David Norton	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
487	4/20/2023	David P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
488	4/20/2023	David R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to Segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
489	3/19/2023	David S	Online	No to segment A, yes to B.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
490	3/13/2023	David Smedley	Email	I live in Tucker Hill at 2300 Grassmere Lane. It's the first house on the southeast side. I'm still baffled that Segment B wasn't selected. Segment A appears that it would be about 100 yards from my house on the South. Then when the bypass turns North the highway will be 1628 feet from my house on the East side. In effect I will be cornered in by the bypass. Also, I understand that you caved to Billingsley and adjusted bringing the North turning part further West towards my house and Tucker Hill. Why in the world would you agree to that? By 380 cornering my house my home value will be dramatically negatively impacted. Will I be compensated. Thank you in advance for your response. Sent from my iPad	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The previous design was approximately 855 feet from the address you provided to the freeway frontage roads. With the design shift, it is approximately 800 feet away from the address provided.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
491	3/9/2023	David Teed	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. David Teed Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
492	4/20/2023	David V	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A go with B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
493	3/16/2023	David Vartian	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
494	2/16/2023	David Vidusek	Online	My comment is for the Coit Road to CR161 (Segment A). This is the best alternative available - given the recommendations of the feasibility and the EIS project over the past few years, this TxDOT preferred alternative is the best option.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
495	3/7/2023	Dawn and Scott Craven	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.  Dawn &amp; Scott Craven  Stonebridge Ranch residents  Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
496	4/20/2023	Dayn J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to Segment A, Yes to Segment B. My home is close to the intersection of Stonebridge Dr / 380, so I will be negatively impacted by Segment A and most likely will need to move after a 16.5 year residence in my Stonebridge home.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
497	3/31/2023	De la Vega Development	Email	<p>Hello Mr. Endres,  I hope you have been well. Please accept this email as De la Vega Development's initial comments regarding the proposed expansion of US Highway 380 near the intersection of Custer Road. It is our understanding that the final design has not been settled however, we remain highly concerned with how the proposed improvements may reduce access to our development. Attached is the overlay of our development's infrastructure (site access) with the proposed highway improvements prepared by the project civil engineer, Burns &amp; McDonnell. As you recall from our March 3rd video conference, West Grove is a multimillion-dollar investment anchored by a Whole Foods Market and other retail and restaurant tenants. As presented in the February 16th public hearing, we were informed by TxDOT officials that the diverging diamond intersection at North Custer Road was the design that would be advanced by TxDOT. That design coupled with a slight realignment of the exit ramp from US 380 to the west provided access to our primary drive for the motoring public exiting the highway ramp. Please refer to the DEIS West Grove Exhibit. During our March 3rd video conference, you informed us that the diverging diamond layout was not going to move forward and the intersection at Custer was now going to be a traditional intersection. However, we now understand in speaking with the City of McKinney earlier this week that there remains much debate regarding which type of intersection will ultimately be arrived at. We would like to request a meeting with you to discuss our design concerns as soon as possible. As was discussed, the Whole Foods lease requires that access to the site shall not be negatively impacted. Given that the store is not currently open, we are focused on protecting our lease and making sure that any offsite changes to access will not trigger a termination right by Whole Foods. We need to mitigate any proposed change that introduces unnecessary risk to the success of our development and brings a termination risk from Whole Foods. We respectfully request continued dialogue on this matter, and we look forward to meeting with you soon. All the best,  JORGE RAMIREZ  CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER  4514 COLE AVENUE, SUITE 815  DALLAS, TEXAS 75205  O: 214.750.7688 x213  [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Comment noted. A traditional interchange is currently being considered by TxDOT. It was shown in the alternative design on the roll plots at the Public Hearing in February and can also be accessed on TxDOT website. The diverging diamond interchange is no longer under consideration.</p> <p>TxDOT is coordinating with the City of McKinney in regards to traffic operations at the interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT has not eliminated access to the property. Both designs showed similar access to the property.</p> <p>TxDOT will meet with your representatives and City of McKinney after the close of the comment period.</p>
498	4/20/2023	Dean F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
499	2/16/2023	Deb Bold	Paper form	I support D for all of the reasons attached. I support D  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted.  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
500	4/20/2023	Debbie B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A ....YES to SEGMENT B!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
501	4/20/2023	Debbie C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
502	3/10/2023	Debbie Cagle Wells	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
503	3/16/2023	Debbie Cagle Wells	Email	I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodland and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable. Sincerely, Debby Block Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material,

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
504	2/22/2023	Debi Ishmael	Online	I oppose route C, and want it changed back to route D	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
505	2/6/2023	Debi Ladd/ Faye Stevens	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
506	4/20/2023	Debora K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A, YES TO SEGMENT B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
507	4/20/2023	Debora S. Kaufmann	Email	<p>Good evening, Please see attached our family's opposition to segment A. Sincerely, Debora S. Kaufmann MBA, Finance and Global Business cell: 818-568-0738 Email: [REDACTED]</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
508	4/20/2023	Deborah P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A. YES to Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
509	4/20/2023	Deborah S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Vote No to proposed Segment A YES TO B for obvious reasons! Lower tax dollars, less business impact, less noise pollution in Tucker Hill, less fatality risk to name a few obvious reasons! I oppose proposed Segment A, and vote NO TO SEGMENT A!!! VOTE YES TO B AS THE PREFERRED OPTION	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
510	2/21/2023	Debra Campbell	Email	<p>My name is Debra Campbell and I live at 2101 State Blvd in McKinney (Tucker Hill)                  [REDACTED] 214-842-1683                  I am not employed by TXDOT or do Business with TXDOT. I will not benefit monetarily from the project or other item about which I am commenting. (It's a shame that other cities, builders etc can't say the same thing. Mane Gait could have lots of options for moving their facility IF the traffic even affected their horses.)                  US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827, Collin County, Texas                  NO TO A. B costs a lot less money and would be least disruptive to traffic in McKinney. I thought it was interesting that there will be 3 lanes going into McKinney and 5 lanes going into Prosper. Prosper is who will benefit the most from this bypass because of their tremendous growth but they are not willing to negotiate for a solution. We should complete the outer loop for Collin County and then reassess what would be best for 380. Make improvements to 380, not this bypass. It makes no sense Tucker Hill worked tirelessly with honesty and integrity seeking viable solutions and advocating for a route that was least impactful overall. The dishonest antics of others (Prosper) paid off for them by encouraging everybody they knew to write in to say NO to B. My cousin who worked in by Highland Park ISD said there were petitions and examples of letters being sent around for everyone to sign. These questions should be answered by people who will be affected by the bypass not individuals for other counties. I was told there was an individual who send in a No to B using all the empty lot addresses. Prosper declaring in November they were putting in a cemetery along Route B so that wouldn't be acceptable. I've been told deals were made to vote for the airport and they would let Route A go thru without resistance. What a bunch of unethical people who got their way. It is not right for this bypass to affect Tucker Hill on two sides while other Cities want the Bypass as long as they don't have to give up anything. So Unfair.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. It is important to note that the number of freeway mainlanes proposed in the US 380 Collin County projects varies depending on the projected traffic demand within the project area. The US 380 project from Teel Parkway/Championship Drive to west of Lakewood Drive is proposed to include three mainlanes in each direction and this McKinney project from Coit Road to FM 1827 is proposed for four mainlanes in each direction.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
511	4/16/2023	Debra Campbell	Email	<p>As a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of political maneuvering, campaigning, and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait that ostensibly has swayed TXDOT's position, and I publicly condemn these actions as unethical. Segment A for the 380 bypass, TXDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents and will demonstrate significant fiscal irresponsibility. This decision is made more egregious with the existence of a viable lower impact. This does not make sense. Please do not proceed with this project without a rigorous study of all pollutants that cause harm to humans and a rigorous health impact analysis to understand both current and future. The pollution appendices are missing critical analyses and portions are invalid as presented. This project should not proceed until those egregious omissions and errors are corrected. Tucker Hill is a very unique front porch community. We spend a lot of time on our porches and walking the neighborhood. I am in my 70's and have had numerous health problems including cancer. Can u guarantee that 380 will Not be detrimental to my health and well being after construction and during construction due to the excessive noise and environmental pollution? Have you researched the correlation between noise and mental and physical health? This can be very stressful and detrimental to everyone's health and well being. I'm also concerned about emergency vehicle access to Tucker Hill. Can you guarantee that Stonebridge will be completed before any construction on 380 Is started in front of Tucker Hill? Why can't the outer loop be used as a solution? Wouldn't it make more sense to connect to NDT and 35??? I'd the 380 segment A is selected and all the studies regarding our health are completed you must promise a depressed 380 in front of Tucker hill with large sound barriers. I can't even imagine how loud the noise will be. Why are we the only neighborhood that will be affected on 2 sides by 380 Bypass and flood plains on the north side with no way to exit the neighborhood I'm the rear. Thanks in advance for your consideration to all my questions.</p> <p>Debra Campbell. Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with FHWA NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. TxDOT conducted a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis including benzene and VOCs (Section 3.12.3 of the DEIS), and a Carbon Monoxide Traffic Air Quality analysis (Section 3.12.2 of the DEIS), included in Appendix P of the DEIS. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 TIP.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>
512	3/7/2023	Debra Flowers	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Debra Flowers Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
513	4/20/2023	Debra J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No more high traffic flow in our communities	Your comment is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
514	3/26/2023	Debra Jordan	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
515	3/14/2023	Debra Kerner	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, debra	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
516	4/20/2023	Debra P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Highway 380: No to Segment A. Yes to Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
517	4/20/2023	Dee P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Oppose segment A, strongly support segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
518	3/16/2023	Deepak Pokhrel	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
519	4/20/2023	Delores M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I'm am against Option A. I'm 81 years old and rather not have to move due to road construction affecting my home!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
520	2/19/2023	Delores Morgan	Email	Good afternoon Stephen! I prefer the blue alternative A segment. I live in Lakewood at Brookhollow in Prosper. Thank you! Delores Morgan [REDACTED] 469-907-8040	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
521	3/12/2023	Denese Berardesco	Comment Form	We live in La Cima (Stonebridge & 380) in Stonebridge. It is unreasonable to see how a freeway and bypasses at Stonebridge & Custer will continue to support values for properties located in La Cima. Currently we have constant Custer/380 noise from early morning to late at night. Now with the new development moving in with De La Vega, we now have clear visibility of all this traffic with more to come. Who at the city of McKinney is protecting our values like the support prosper had?	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.
522	3/7/2023	Denise Bouhasin	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX. for over 26 years, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement SEGMENT B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for your careful consideration for this bypass. ✪ Denise Bouhasin ✪ Round Hill Rd. McKinney TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
523	1/20/2023	Denise VanderHeiden	Email	<p>Why would DOT choose to disrupt hundreds if not thousands of homeowners and put a route close to Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill when they could go up Custer Road? Is it because the Mane Event horse people have so much money and have such good PR? This is ridiculous and stinks of political payoff. I think DOT should look at areas of less impact on current residents. Mane Event can stay where they are if the route goes up Custer Road (it has been proved that it would not affect the horses) and, if they don't like it, they can relocate! Many of the homeowners that will be affected do not have the same resources that Mane Event has. Sadly, that is probably why we will end up dealing with the horrible effects of having a huge freeway cutting through our neighborhoods where many houses and families live. I hope that DOT will reconsider and put this bypass in an area that won't affect so many families that have no choice but to stay in their homes in this terrible real estate market that we find ourselves in with the high interest rates making it another impediment to moving. I have lived here for 13 years and am very close to highway 380, same as hundreds of other households that would be affected by this. We do not have the option of moving. It is unconscionable that DOT would do this to this many homeowners as opposed to displaced a horse therapy operation. Regards, Denise VanderHeiden</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. While the Preferred Alternative is adjacent to the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods, it does not bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>The considerations you mention are some of the many factors TxDOT considered in its selection of the Preferred Alternative (Blue A+E+C). Engineering, social, economic, and environmental impacts have been thoroughly evaluated in the Draft EIS. For more information on the mitigation measures proposed, please refer to the DEIS.</p> <p>Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>To view the Segment Analysis Matrix, please visit <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
524	3/7/2023	Denise VanderHeiden	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
525	2/22/2023	Dennis and Lesley Croysdale	Online	<p>The presentation showing how Alternative A was decided upon was poor. The obstacles to choosing Alternative B looked superior and no one was available to explain why Alternative B was not selected. The lack of sound barriers at Stonebridge Dr. was disturbing and the explanation why they would not be built was inadequate. The use of 2005 software to estimate the amount of sound from the new highway appears to be inadequate and the explanation given as to the actual sound once construction was completed did not indicate that sound barriers would be added subsequently. Accordingly, we are opposed to the current decision to adopt Alt A and would support Alt B.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. The project team analyzed the areas around all alternatives through multiple in-person field visits where Right of Entry (ROE) was granted, use of aerial imagery/maps, and existing databases including Collin County Appraisal District listings.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise including using the federally required software from 2005. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness.</p>
526	3/15/2023	Dennis Burkett	Email	<p>Good afternoon Stephen,            Again, thanks for your dedication to these projects! I'm sure you'll be glad when this one is finalized &amp; you guys are able to start the process for construction. I would like to suggest that because of the on-going current construction of Ridge Road north of US 380 (bridge over the creek, etc.) that the choice to go east of Tucker Hill will be much more expensive than previously estimated. This project (which is currently well underway) is significant (a divided 4-lane roadway). I would anticipate that it's completion will require additional re-drawing of the 380 project. Thus I would again suggest that the route which goes west of Tucker Hill &amp; west of Custer Road would be a better choice. (I realize that ManeGait's 14 acres is a political issue, but surely their relocation would not be as expensive as some might suggest. Additionally I understand that the Darling family has some experience in acquiring &amp; developing land when they were previously involved in subdivision development.) Thanks for accepting feedback from area residents!            Dennis Burkett            (████████████████████)</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p>Throughout the Feasibility Study and EIS, TxDOT has been working with the City of McKinney on this project and all of their local roadway projects. The US 380 project would not have to be changed to accommodate for improvements to Ridge Road as currently being constructed.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
527	2/22/2023	Dennis De Mattei	Email	Hello, I would like to express my support for the “ Blue Alignment” as shown on the latest DEIS at it adequately addresses the environmental, social and engineering requirements of the project. Sincerely, Dennis J. De Mattei 300 Yosemite Drive Prosper, TX 75078	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
528	4/3/2023	Dennis Duffin	Online	I totally disagree with access (or lack thereof) to Stickhorse Lane in Segment C. It appears the designers have failed to accommodate passage for residents in that area.	Your comment is noted. Design in this area is still underway and will connect all three projects. A future Public Hearing for the Princeton project will be held to provide more details and an updated design. You can find project information and to sign up to receive Public Hearing notices at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a> .  During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.
529	4/20/2023	Dennis McKee	Email	To whom it may concern: This letter contains questions to which I seek answers and expresses how this project will personally impact my and my wife’s quality of life.  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	<i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
530	4/20/2023	Dennis S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A and yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
531	2/6/2023	Dent Doctor	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
532	2/17/2023	Dhruv Patel	Online	<p>I am voicing my concern towards Segment C - vs not choosing Segment D - there are various factor missed on segment C - where it states residences that effects segments - matter of fact there are lot more than listed residents that effected by choosing segment C - matter of fact when study suggests that segment D is more faster and also improving wetland (contrast there are lot more wildlife on segment C which seems to be missed by your study) - there are about 8 residents specially on Roll 12 that choose by study that missed why not adjust roll 12 to more east-side is completely another argument (otherside is not even touched because it's owned by prominent well known Glaciers) - segment C was completely opposed by texas wildlife and preffered segment D. ) Overall when Segment C effects more people and more businesses - reasons provided was it would cost less - when making decision smaller and better/faster segment D is more faster and less time consuming for traffic.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs. The project team analyzed the areas around Segments C and D through multiple in-person field visits, use of aerial imagery/maps, and existing databases including Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) listings. Additionally, you can reference the DEIS Appendix O for the species analysis and Appendix N for more details about water resources.</p> <p>Texas Parks and Wildlife (TPWD) comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
533	3/1/2023	Diana Heald	Online	<p>What a travesty to do route C and demolish 22 homes and 35 businesses. Why not use route D and the flood plane that does no one any good and saves people's property. TX Dot will lose all trust and value as other gov't agencies have.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.</p> <p>It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>
534	4/20/2023	Diana R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>My neighborhood that I moved to to keep away from high traffic will only get noisier. Unless they plan to redo all our windows to noiseless windows.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
535	4/18/2023	Diane and Carl Heldreth	Email	<p>Hi Stephen,                      I previously sent an email - but with the date coming soon...I am just re-emphasizing my husband and I say - "No to Segment A". Just from a monetary/cost standpoint - - (which should be "the #1 reason/item TxDot should look at" - - Segment B costs less, so why not go with Segment B? I am truly praying that common sense and TxDot looking at the lower cost of Segment B (less expensive, less destruction of homes, businesses, etc.) in addition to the reasons below ... Will Prevail!!!! 🙏 Thank you, Stephen!                      Have a great week!                      Diane and Carl Heldreth                      Stonebridge Ranch resident (for approx. 17 years)                      And:                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.                      Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
536	3/16/2023	Diane Arnold	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
537	2/17/2023	Diane Bednar	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:                      1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.                      2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.                      3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.                      4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.                      5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.                      6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.                      7) Section C also has worse traffic performance. Regards,</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material,</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
538	4/20/2023	Diane D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is the best	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
539	4/20/2023	Diane H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please select Segment B ... it costs less, reduces taxes on McKinney residents, less homes and businesses destroyed, and less disruption to thousands+ McKinney residents in Stonebridge Ranch and McKinney. Thank you!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
540	2/21/2023	Diane Heldreth	Email	Hi Stephen, I hope you are doing well! My husband and I live in Stonebridge Ranch in McKinney and have lived here for almost 17 years! We still live here - because we love McKinney...wonderful neighborhood! My husband and I have plans tonight, otherwise we'd be there to hear info and ask questions. Per emails from Stonebridge Ranch HOA - it says the project that TXDOT is proposing will cost "McKinney residents an unbudgeted \$120 Million Dollars"? We don't understand why residents of McKinney have to be responsible for paying the unbudgeted \$120 million dollars? As you know - there will be millions/billions++ drivers' that will forever be using 380, etc. (non-residents of McKinney, out of towners, visitors, out of state truckers, etc.) - so, why do McKinney residents have to pay the \$120 million dollar bill? We also understand per the information received, that if you stay with the projected plan, it will disrupt many homes/homeowners' dream homes, and many businesses (who I would imagine chose their locations to build their businesses and build their clientele/ customers). If any of this information is incorrect, please let me know. Also, if this project happens - will Highway 380 and all other roads involved in this project be Toll Roads? And, if so, where would the toll road money be allocated for years' to come? Wish we could be there tonight...and, if you are able to provide/email the meeting Minutes, we would appreciate it! Thank you, Stephen! Respectfully, Diane Heldreth	Your comment is noted. TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.  Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 43, Section 15.52 requires local governments be responsible for a specified percentage of project costs. The minimum percentage of local participation is designated by the department on a case-by-case basis but is typically 10% of actual project costs. TAC 43, Section 15.55 also allows the Transportation Commission to require, request, or accept from a local government matching or other funds, rights-of-way, utility adjustments, additional participation, planning, documents, or any other local incentives.  The dollar amount you mention is an estimate and still needs to be finalized since the project costs provided at the Public Hearing are high-level estimates, using the information available now. As final design continues, these will be updated.  Tolling is not being considered as a funding option for this project.
541	3/7/2023	Diane Herod	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Diane Herod Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
542	2/23/2023	Diane Miller	Comment Form	Switch back to D - protect the animal rescue. Please protect the Mane Gait facility. It is designed to rescue horses and provide therapeutic riding for disabled children and others. I am a retired occupational therapist and worked w/ children at the Wylie facility. It was magical for my patients in importing confidence, posture, strength, balance and just fun. Families come there to help. Beneficial to all involved. Plus the animals have been rescued and another move will traumatize them this facility needs to be protected.	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which runs along the existing US 380 from Coit Road to Ridge Road, therefore not impacting ManeGait.
543	3/7/2023	Diane Miller	Email	When considering the 380by pass, Please choose option D which is mostly flood plane and disturbs fewer homes and farms than option C. It really matters to those who live in the path. Thank you Diane Miller	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
544	2/22/2023	Diane Reynolds	Email	My husband and I retired in Tucker Hill 10 years ago. We have been involved in meetings concerning this issue for the past several years, and the decision to use the most expensive route is outrageous. Tucker Hill has one way in and one way out of this neighborhood. Residents enter and leave the neighborhood via 380. The promise of a Stonebridge extension going north has been promised since we purchased our home, but nothing has been done. When this construction on the 380 bypass begins we will essentially be landlocked. Emergency vehicles will not have easy access to Tucker Hill, and the construction, air quality, and noise will be unbearable for residents living in Tucker Hill. From all the bullet points I've read, Main Gait, and the parks, etc. recently started in Prosper are the deciding factors for TxDot. How can TxDot justify the additional cost of this route over the less expensive routes? This decision is wasteful of resources and irresponsible of cost. TxDot needs to do the right thing by ALL taxpayers and not just those that live in Prosper and on Main Gate property. Also, why is the Outer Loop that is already under development not considered instead of the bypass. Diane Reynolds 7416 Ardmore St McKinney, TX 75071	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
545	3/27/2023	Diane Reynolds	Online	<p>Dear Mr Endres</p> <p>Building the bypass using Option B will not solve the traffic issues along 380 to 75 where the biggest backups occur n McKinney. The construction and road pollution will cause health problems and birth defects for those in close proximity. Why are horses for therapy more important than people who live 24/7 in homes surrounded by this Option B? Main Gate was offered a place to move and they refused. How does one entity or individual have this much power with TxDot? The additional cost, displacement of more homes and businesses should absolutely be considered in this decision. Option A has clearly been stated to be millions less in cost than Option B with less displacements. How can TxDot justify this decision? Please consider another Option for 380 or no bypass at all. The new Universal Studios on 380 in Frisco will change or make the current Option B obsolete.</p> <p>Diane Reynolds</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>
546	3/27/2023	Diane Reynolds	Online	<p>I don't have a copy of my previous comment, but I think I wrote option b, but option A is the one going around Tucker Hill. Option A is the one I oppose for the reasons previously listed. Sorry for the confusion!</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
547	4/20/2023	Diane Reynolds	Email	<p>Stephen:                      As a McKinney homeowner and tax payer, I find that TXDT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B to be fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers by costing over \$150 million more. TXDT applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. The political maneuvering, campaigning and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait has swayed TXDT's position. I find these actions unethical and improper. My neighborhood, Tucker Hill, will be effectively cut off from the City of McKinney by Segment A. We have only one way in and one way out of this neighborhood. How will TXDT mitigate this problem? We have been promised another entrance for years. My husband and I chose this neighborhood for the front porch community and close proximity to Baylor Hospital. Access to emergency services are important for all of us in Tucker Hill. Please explain how our safety will be considered for emergency situations with only one entrance? Unlike those who utilize the services at ManeGait periodically, we live in our homes 24/7. We will experience increased air pollution and increased noise pollution 24/7 reducing our quality of life and forcing us to stay inside our homes as much as possible. TXDT's study of air pollution was based on 1MPH wind. The wind in TuckerHill is consistently much higher in the 10-20 MPH range. I check the wind frequently because of my allergies. How can TXDT justify the 1MPH study? The study is most definitely flawed with incorrect data. Families in TuckerHill with medical conditions, allergies and disabilities will be negatively impacted by the new conditions of a freeway surrounding our neighborhood. ManeGait was given more consideration than an entire community of McKinney citizens that live 24/7 in their homes as opposed to a client population who visit periodically. ManeGait was offered another location at no charge, but they refused the offer. Our neighborhood residents do not have the option of a no cost relocation. We currently experience consistent traffic backups from Ridge Rd to Hwy 75. How does Segment A impact that portion of 380? Will Segment A alleviate traffic problems from Ridge Rd to Hwy75? Does TXDT have data on the traffic traveling east on this portion of 380 that need a northern route at this intersection? Ridge Rd is currently being built out going north across 380. Has TXDT considered using this Ridge Rd north artery instead of building the bypass in close proximity to this newly constructed road? Please consider the less expensive and less disruptive route Segment B or look for another completely different option.                      Diane Reynolds                      7416 Ardmore St                      McKinney TX 75071                      Sent from my iPhone 11</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is again noted. The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p> <p>A Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. The CAL3QHC air dispersion model parameters used in the Carbon Monoxide Traffic Air Quality Analysis (CO TAQA) are specified in the TxDOT Environmental Guide: Volume 2 Activity Instructions (DEIS Appendix P, CO TAQA Technical Report, Table 12). The wind speed used was one meter per second (m/s), equivalent to 2.24 miles per hour. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>A new location freeway would likely attract traffic away from the existing US 380, thereby alleviating congestion, and reducing the number of crashes. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix. A new location freeway that diverges from US 380 at Ridge Road would potentially displace more existing residents than the proposed Segment A. It is also likely that there would be issues with impacts to community resources such as the Zinger Bat and Aviator ball parks.</p>
548	2/25/2023	Diane Skiff	Online	We do. Or want 380 encroaching deep into Prosper. Keep 380 where it is. McKinney's failure to plan is not and should not be our burden to bear. Thank you.	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
549	4/20/2023	Dianna D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Not to segment A. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
550	3/14/2023	Dianna Porter	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Dianna Porter Stonebridge Ranch McKinney resident and local business supporter	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
551	3/16/2023	Dianne Blankenstein	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
552	4/20/2023	Dick E	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A. B is a better option.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
553	2/17/2023	Diego Valadez	Online	Segment C would greatly interfere with my daily commute. I live about half a mile north of 380 right at New Hope rd. I will have traffic at my doorstep ALL day. I would like segment D to be approved.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
554	2/25/2023	Dillon Mitchell	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, With great respect, I ask that you consider my comments below regarding the 380 bypass. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Reasons to consider OPPOSING Segment A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs taxpayers \$98.8 million more</li> <li>• Impacts 57% more natural wetlands &amp; wildlife</li> <li>• Negatively impacts Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods</li> </ul> Reasons to SUPPORT Segment B: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires 73% fewer business and residential displacements</li> <li>• Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at U.S. 380 &amp; Custer Road</li> <li>• 14% shorter, saving time and money</li> </ul> Thank you for your consideration, Dillon Mitchell	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
555	4/20/2023	Dinah R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
556	3/6/2023	DJ Mechler	Email	<p>Why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County.</li> <li>• C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>• C disturbs the wetlands that serve as a refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• C eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.</li> <li>• C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D).</li> <li>• C divides residential and farming/ranching communities.</li> <li>• C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources.</li> <li>• C has worse traffic performance (lower traffic capacity, slower travel speeds, and more elevation changes).</li> </ul> <p>Please oppose Segment C and make Segment D the preferred route. Thank you.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
557	3/16/2023	Djakhangir Zakhidov	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
558	3/20/2023	Dmitry Savy	Online	After reviewing the engineering studies, EIS study, and additional resources, I agree with the alignment of Segment A. It will allow many valuable areas to remain or still be usable without close proximity to the highway. This includes the planned Rutherford Park in Prosper, the planned PISD Science and Learning Center, and existing Mane Gait Therapeutic Rehabilitation Horse Center. As well it allows the many community housing developments that are already in construction or pre-construction to continue.	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.
559	4/20/2023	Dolisa D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose the Segment A option. Segment B, as the less expensive and less disruptive option, would be the better choice.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
560	3/14/2023	Dolisa Douthitt	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Dolisa Douthitt	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
561	3/28/2023	Don DeBoer	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. My property value is ALREADY being negatively impacted and once construction begins it will be SEVERLY impacted. Did TxDot even consider the economic impact on homeowners within half a mile of Segment A? I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. The choice of Segment A strongly suggests inappropriate influence by pro-Prosper sources. We have yet to hear any rational and transparent explanation for this choice. Sincerely, Don DeBoer	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
562	3/15/2023	Don Hooton	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Don Hooton 7713 Thistledown Dr. McKinney, TX 75071	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
563	3/26/2023	Don Maher	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Don Maher 5213 Turnbridge Ct McKinney Tx 75072 Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
564	4/20/2023	Don S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Common sense and logic would choose segment B over segment A! The reasons are obvious!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
565	1/24/2023	Don Silver	Email	Mr. Endres, Can you tell me under the proposed plan approximately how many feet away would the bypass be to: 1. 7405 Continental Dr, McKinney 2. 3701 Texas Dall Court, McKinney approximately Also, if there's a detailed map showing this, that would be helpful, too. Thanks, Don	7405 Continental Dr., McKinney is 1.6 miles away and 3701 Texas Dall Court, McKinney is approximately 0.52 miles away.  For a detailed map, see the schematic design roll plots at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
566	2/6/2023	Don/Lona Harris	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
567	2/28/2023	Donald L. Stopfel and Lisa Stopfel	Email	<p>To: Stephen Endres, TXDOT February 28, 2023 NO TO ROUTE "A" OF 380 PROJECT</p> <p>As both a resident of Stonebridge Ranch and a Realtor, I do not support the preferred route "A" for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NOISE: TXDOT's noise study is flawed in multiple assumptions. As a P.E. who has managed similar projects points out, once completed, current &amp; distant home owners WILL experience an increase in noise levels from the elevated bridges with low walls &amp; increased traffic speeds.</li> <li>2. HOME VALUES: Thousands of north Texas Realtors calculate property values daily via competitive pricing analysis. It is A FACT that close proximity to busy highways lowers property selling prices &amp; reduces the number of prospective buyers. The projected duration of the TXDOT 380 route "A" will negatively impact property values FOR YEARS.</li> <li>3. CONSTRUCTION: The dirt generated by a project of this size &amp; duration historically produces significant dust on surrounding properties. Traffic flow becomes bumper-to-bumper as the current TXDOT Denton to Collin County line project does.</li> <li>4. CONFLICT OF INTERESTS: Developers heavily invested in their own current &amp; future Parker development projects publicly supported the PAC that rallied Parker &amp; surrounding "Commentors" This is in direct violation of the State of Texas ergo TXDOT's operating protocol.</li> <li>5. COST: The \$100,000,000+ (&amp; historically more) is hardly justified by TXDOT's flawed sales pitch</li> </ol> <p>Donald L. Stopfel &amp; Lisa Stopfel 6820 Thorntree Drive Mckinney, TX 75072</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. Noise barriers were proposed for Stonebridge Ranch. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS. It is also important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Public input and cost are important factors but not the only factors that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS. TxDOT, at its sole discretion, will make the final selection of an alignment for the project in the Record of Decision.</p>
568	4/20/2023	Donald M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B only !!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
569	3/4/2023	Donald Martinez	Email	<p>Stephen, I am writing in opposition of segment A. Option B continues to be a better option, less expensive and less north/south versus A. B also impacts less established neighborhoods versus A. The overpass at Stonebridge Drive is such a significant impact to North Texas' largest master planned community they has been here for over 30 years. The argument that B is impacting neighborhoods is laughable considering those neighborhoods are not even built, yet alone not established for 30 years. I I also do not understand why Prosper is treated differently with the layout from Coit to Custer. From the flyovers, it appears that the road is much smaller and less impactful in that section. Why cannot it not be that way through Custer? A better solution for Stonebridge Drive must be engineered if A ends up being the option. Again, I strongly oppose option A as a resident of Stonebridge Ranch. Thank you, Donald Martinez</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The right-of-way width for the project varies through the corridor from Coit Road to FM 1827. For example, more right-of-way is usually required around interchanges. The right-of-way that would need to be acquired for the project between Custer Road and Ridge Road is narrower at between 257 to 271 feet wide. TxDOT is already proposing mitigation by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods which is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway. Appendix C of the DEIS and the schematic roll plots provide more detail on all typical sections for the project.</p>
570	4/3/2023	Donald Sams	Online	<p>Someone from TXDOT needs to show the residents on Stickhorse Lane, at the west end of CR 330 will have access to the new intersection of Hwy 380 and the new New Hope road intersection. From the colored diagram that we have seen it appears that we will have to back tract to the east on CR 330 to access Hwy 380 in order to travel west into the city of McKinney.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Design in this area is still underway and will connect all three projects. A future Public Hearing for the Princeton project will be held to provide more details and an updated design. You can find project information and to sign up to receive Public Hearing notices at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a>.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p>
571	4/20/2023	Donna K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
572	3/7/2023	Donna Tarallo	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Donna Tarallo 2608 White Owl Dr. McKinney, TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
573	4/20/2023	Donna W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I oppose Segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
574	4/3/2023	Doug Ashby	Online	I live at the far north end of Tucker Hill. I am opposed to Route A and strongly prefer Route B. We have several hundred families who will be impacted detrimentally by Route A. This is mainly because TH has just one entrance and exit to the neighborhood. This will make emergency response - especially to the houses at the north end - unacceptable. This is a major health concern. Also, digging out the existing 380 with no protective barriers will create unacceptable health hazards to residents in TH. There are not any sound barriers which will make my home difficult to live in, as there is nothing between my house and the north portion of Route A. Then there is the financial consideration in that Route A will cost \$200M more for no known benefit. Thank you, Doug Ashby	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.  In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.  TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
575	2/27/2023	Doug Dodson	Email	<p>Sir - I dont understand at all the merits of choosing a more expensive option that disrupt more businesses and homes. WHY SEGMENT B VERSUS SEGMENT A? I've attended two different public hearings and i just don't get it. As a resident of Stonebridge Ranch, with my home about ,2 miles from the current intersection of 380 and Stonebridge Drive, I cannot express how much I oppose the SEGMENT B option. The McKinney City Council and the Stonebridge Rancg HOA feel the same. Won't you reconsider your recommendation?</p> <p>Thank you Doug Dodson 1408 Haverford Way McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which does not include Segment B. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>
576	4/20/2023	Doug I	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	STRONGLY OPPOSE the construction of segment A and STONGLY SUPPORT the segment B construction option.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
577	3/16/2023	Doug Maddox	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
578	3/16/2023	Doug Maxey	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
579	2/17/2023	Douglas Clark	Online	NO bypass in Prosper!!! Stop your political agenda. TXDOT has wasted so much time trying to find alternatives for a route that should have been built years ago. Too late, move on! GO NORTH!	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
580	3/16/2023	Douglas A Beale	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
581	1/28/2023	Douglas Clark	Online	Stop pushing an expansion and bypass that the residents of both McKinney and a prosper do not want or support. If this expansion was done years ago when there was more open land perhaps residents would feel differently. By continuing to try and impose a bypass only frustrates the established communities and does nothing to benefit them and only causes harm to them. If a bypass or extension is needed consider going North into Celina where there is much more open undeveloped land. You all are wasting so much time trying to force something bc that is just not beneficial due to the established businesses and homes. So make it easy and start looking North!!	Your comment and opposition to the project is noted. Results of public input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix that can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .  It is important to note that there are also similar impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
582	3/22/2023	Douglas Mousel	Online	On behalf of 310 Prosper, LP and 104 Prosper, LP, I am submitting comments in support of TxDOT's selection of the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative for the US 380 McKinney Improvements from Coit Road to FM 1827. Specifically, we support TxDOT's selection of Segment A over Segment B for the reasons stated in the EIS and TxDOT's presentation. We are also supportive of the minor design changes under consideration for final design. Thank you. Douglas Mousel [REDACTED]	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
583	4/20/2023	Douglas T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Choose the B route!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
584	2/21/2023	Duke Monson	Online	<p>The interim design change 'Inset G: Alternative Design' shown on Segment C Roll 17 is totally unacceptable. It forces any FM1827 traffic bound for Princeton or for the west side of McKinney to use the west-bound Segment C service road until the next Segment C U-turn interchange, then perform the U-turn and proceed on the east-bound Segment C service road until that service road intersects with University, and then turn westward if heading for McKinney, or eastward if heading for Princeton. The alternative is to use local roads (such as Rockcrest/Tarvin) to find a different path to University and then go east or west on University (with all the problems that entails today, with no traffic lights to manage the traffic onto US380 from local roads). Until the Princeton US380 bypass is built, there won't be any real lessening of traffic coming from the north and east of New Hope, and none of it will want to use the Inset G route (in my opinion). I think the initial at-grade interchange of Spur 399 and US380 should remain as presented in November 2022 at the last Spur 399 public hearing. As the eastern end of Segment C is built out, the Spur 399 interchange can be extended (underneath the elevated Segment C) to have at-grade interchanges with the east and westbound service roads of Segment C. Again, as the eastern end of Segment C is built out, the FM1827 interchange can be built as presented on Roll 17 of Segment C (without the Inset G change). This will allow traffic to access University much as it does today to get to McKinney or Princeton. At some point in time, there will be two interchanges at-grade (one for FM1827 and one for Spur 399) within close proximity. I don't see that as a problem, certainly not enough of a problem to force the Inset G option to be built and used. A future upgrade (if traffic volume warrants it), would be to add fly-overs from Spur 399 to the east- and west-bound Segment C service roads from the north and south Spur 399 roadways.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the alternative design for Segment C.</p> <p>The purpose of Inset G design was to not increase traffic on FM 1827 and was originally in coordination with Town of New Hope representatives. TxDOT will continue to work with the Town of New Hope and consider any updated or future comments about the project.</p>
585	4/20/2023	Dustin M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Save the restaurants!	Your comment is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
586	2/28/2023	Dusttin Pearson	Online	The proposed alignment of B vs. proposed alignment of A has a significant increase in cost. Why was A not chosen over B? How much of the project is requested to be funded by the City of McKinney? There is already an existing Collin County outer loop being constructed, wouldn't it make more sense to tie this project into that loop rather than displace and disrupt existing properties, families, and businesses along 380? The Tucker Hill Neighborhood requests additional sound barrier considerations as option B radically impacts the Tucker Hill neighborhood.	<p>Your comment is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
587	4/20/2023	Earl T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote for route segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
588	3/7/2023	Ed and Melody Smith	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Ed and Melody Smith 1612 Fife Hills Drive McKinney, TX 75072 Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
589	3/16/2023	Ed Balli	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
590	4/20/2023	Ed Gistaro	Email (2)	Mr. Endres, As one of the elderly residents of Tucker Hill, I have written to you several times regarding my opposition to Option A for the ByPass. Below is a more eloquent and substantiated numerous reasons why this is a bad idea. Our community has worked tirelessly trying to get our concerns heard that would result in a different choice. Below consists of the documented reasons why it is not too late to reconsider your decision. I sincerely hope it helps sway you to our side.  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
591	4/20/2023	Ed H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A is short sighted as homes & business and transit traffic will continue to develop around the Segment, thus continuing to hamper traffic flow. Be a Leader and continue to enhance the benefits of living in McKinney.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
592	3/16/2023	Ed Sommer	Email	<p>It would appear that those with the loudest voices take precedence over common sense. Adding a route parallel to 380 as far as I 35 north of Denton will provide significant traffic relief for decades. Now 380 is used for local traffic and is the primary route East and West to the tollway and Denton. The cost of fuel will move the big trucks to the freeway to avoid the stoplights. That alone would open up 380 because those trucks block traffic by running side by side holding up two or three lanes. Residents of Prosper and West would most likely choose to add a few miles to their drive as it would be a faster drive to 75 on a new freeway with savings in fuel and emissions. 380 has a lot of businesses bringing revenue to the city. Disrupting those businesses will be a tax burden to the residents. A new road will provide opportunities for new businesses to surface and help with future tax needs. Put yourself in the position of driving from 75 to the toll way. Given the choice of option A or driving a new freeway, which would you honestly choose? This is what we are all facing. Main gate can and should be moved. This single obstacle is impeding the lives of 10's of thousand people for years to come. I could probably write chapters on why route A is a poor choice but my single voice in a crowd of yelling people will go unnoticed. I appreciate the opportunity to share a few of my opinions.</p> <p>Warm Regards, Edward Sommer Ed Sommer</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p>
593	4/17/2023	Ed Sommer	Email	<p>200 million back into your budget. Goes a long way to make other improvements</p> <p>Ed Sommer</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
594	4/18/2023	Ed Thompson	Online	<p>A,E,C if we must. With SRT widening and the Outer Loop, this will likely not be as needed in the future.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
595	2/21/2023	Edie Fife	Online	Has TxDOT considered making 380 a 2-level highway? The lower level could handle local traffic for businesses, restaurants, and residences while the upper level would accommodate through traffic. For example, morning commuters wanting to drive from east of McKinney west to the Tollway could use the upper level to quickly commute west. There would be no traffic signals on the upper levels, similar to N Dallas Tollway. This approach would significantly minimize the number of properties that would be subject to eminent domain. The lower level would not disrupt businesses because they would not be bypassed and would still be accessible to local residents. There is already noise from 380, so adding a second level would not substantially increase noise along the 380 corridor. Noise abatement or remediation could be handled with berms and installation of evergreens such as cedars and hollies. Thank you for considering this option. A Prosper Texas homeowner	Double decked (or elevated) freeway sections were considered during the Feasibility Study. It will not be further considered for the corridor because it would not substantially reduce the amount of right-of-way needed to construct the roadway, and it would be more expensive. It's important to note that TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove elevated freeways in several locations across the state, including I-35 in downtown Austin.  Vegetation such as trees, shrubs and grasses, though very natural and attractive in appearance, offer little reduction in noise levels. Therefore, it is not considered part of the project
596	4/20/2023	Edward B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A and YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
597	4/20/2023	Edward F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	What is driving TxDOT to choose Segment A when Segment B is clearly the better choice from a cost/benefit standpoint.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B
598	4/20/2023	Edward J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No on Segment A yes to Segment B. Changing now is just wrong and too costly to McKinney tax payers.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
599	4/20/2023	Edward K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please save taxpayers money, save businesses in our community, and implement option B.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
600	4/20/2023	Edward S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please, find a common sense solution.	Your comment is noted.
601	4/20/2023	Edward S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>It would appear that those with the loudest voices take precedence over common sense. Adding a route parallel to 380 as far as I 35 north of Denton will provide significant traffic relief for decades. Now 380 is used for local traffic and is the primary route East and West to the tollway and Denton. The cost of fuel will move the big trucks to the freeway to avoid the stoplights. That alone would open up 380 because those trucks block traffic by running side by side holding up two or three lanes. Residents of Prosper and West would most likely choose to add a few miles to their drive as it would be a faster drive to 75 on a new freeway with savings in fuel and emissions. 380 has a lot of businesses bringing revenue to the city. Disrupting those businesses will be a tax burden to the residents. A new road will provide opportunities for new businesses to surface and help with future tax needs. Put yourself in the position of driving from 75 to the toll way. Given the choice of option A or driving a new freeway, which would you honestly choose? This is what we are all facing. Main gate can and should be moved. This single obstacle is impeding the lives of 10\'s of thousand people for years to come. I could probably write chapters on why route A is a poor choice but my single voice in a crowd of yelling people will go unnoticed. I appreciate the opportunity to share a few of my opinions.</p> <p>Warm Regards, Edward Sommer</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>
602	3/15/2023	Edward Siegel	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Edward Siegel</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
603	4/20/2023	Elaine C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	My tax dollars can be better spent than on segment A. Segment B is the better choice since it is more cost effective and destroys fewer businesses and established homes.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
604	3/8/2023	Elaine Davis	Email	Dear Mr. Endres: I own a home in Stonebridge Ranch in McKinney, TX I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Elaine Davis	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
605	4/20/2023	Elda S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I cannot fathom paying 100m more (minimum) of tax payer money, when there are other, more feasible options. Option B will be devastating to our neighborhood, as we have the misfortune of being positioned the closest to 380. Please reconsider.	Your comment is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
606	3/13/2023	Eldon Patterson	Email	<p>It looks like C will affect more homes and businesses than D. It also appears to be longer and affect more wildlife area. I think that everyone has lost track on why this is being done. I drive from Farmersville to McKinney at least 3 times a week. The biggest traffic problem is at New Hope road. Traffic is always backed up there. Neither of these routes fixes that problem. The next biggest problem is getting thru Princeton. Princeton is growing rapidly, and the traffic is bad. If you started a route around Princeton near Princeton high school and bypass the C/D route completely, that would solve a lot of problems. I know you have plans to build a loop around Princeton. Why not combine them. For the last few years, I have noticed all the road work around me. It appears that TXDot has forgotten who they work for. TXDot rebuilt hwy 78 from Farmersville to hwy 121 recently. It is a great-smooth road. However, it is dangerous. For 10 miles, there are very few passing zones. The zones that are there are unusable. People make their own passing zones. That is a recipe for disaster. I know there have been wrecks. I don't know how many and how bad. TXDot rebuilt 3 miles of FM2194 about 2 years ago. While they were building it, they ripped my home phone landline 2 times. That is my 911 line. It was out of service for at least 2 weeks. I am 86 years old. I cannot be without phone service. When I asked the person that took out my line if he cut my line, he said "Yes, and there is nothing you can do about it!". The owner of the crew did help speed up the fix but they all think that an individual problem is not anything they are going to be held accountable for with TXDot. TXDot behaves as if it is in Washington DC from the way they support the citizens of this state. Please do not forget why 380 workarounds are occurring and make some good, educated decisions.</p> <p>Concerned Citizen Eldon Patterson 972-784-7167 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TXDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TXDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TXDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p>
607	3/3/2023	Elena Rush	Online	<p>I have a significant investment in my home at 7404 Stanhope Street, McKinney, TX. The proposed route and its attendant noise, traffic, and other negative impacts will diminish my home's value. Why wasn't this road improvement routed along Custer and northeast through undeveloped property affecting fewer residential units? I oppose the route near Tucker Hill.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TXDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
608	3/24/2023	Elena Travassos	Email	Dear Senator Paxton, Representative Leach and Mr Endres , I am a McKinney resident and I strongly oppose Segment C , and support Segment D as an alternative . Segment D affects a significantly lower amount of residential and business properties and prevents them from losing their homes and livelihood . Also , Segment D would allow our beautiful city of McKinney to keep more forests and woodlands , grasslands and prairies, and allow to preserve the natural habitat of different animals that make our city so unique . City of McKinney 's official slogan is "Unique By Nature " . Me , my family and my neighbors would love to see McKinney continue to live by their principles . Thank you for caring . Best regards , Elena Travassos McKinney resident . Sent from my iPhone	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D are noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.</p> <p>It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p>
609	2/16/2023	Eli Nuntley	Paper form	Option C is disruptive to our home and business. Option D is much better. There appears to be considerable hand in other locations bot as disruptive as C.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.
610	4/20/2023	Elizabeth A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Rd To FM 1827. The option of Segment B appears to be far less disruptive, less expensive and will destroy fewer businesses and homes. Segment B option has my support.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
611	4/20/2023	Elizabeth B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A in US bypass project.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
612	2/16/2023	Elizabeth Bloemer	Email	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>As a frequent visitor to north Texas with many friends and family in the area, including in the area affected by the proposed bypass highway, I am very concerned about the impact of this expansion on my friends in McKinney. Please abandon Plan C. It will financially ruin too many people who cannot afford a catastrophic loss of the property values of their homes and land. Plan D will affect far fewer people and therefore make it more feasible to fairly compensate them for what they will lose in the values of their properties. Smart growth, first and foremost, must respect ownership of private property, one of our most basic freedoms in this country. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Sincerely, Elizabeth Bloemer Sterling, MA</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.</p>
613	2/17/2023	Elizabeth Bloemer	Email	<p>Thank you, Stephen. My good friends, the Borchard Family, alerted me to this situation, and they are very concerned about its impact on their apiary. They have spent years developing it and helping others get started in beekeeping. I hope the Texas DOT will reconsider its plans in favor of one that doesn't hurt so many families, their homes and their livelihoods. Cordially, Elizabeth "Erzsi" Bloemer</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.</p>
614	4/20/2023	Elizabeth M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Absolutely NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B. Segment A would have a direct impact on my home. It just makes sense to implement Segment B which would cost less and negatively impact fewer people.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>
615	1/22/2023	Elizabeth Minchey	Email	<p>Mr. Hale and Mr. Endres, I am writing to you both in support of Segment D for the 380 Bypass. I am vehemently against Segment C, as it will have a negative impact on more community members and damage a precious natural habitat. I have lived at 1510 County Road 339 for 22 years, and I have watched Collin county experience rapid growth. It is our duty to protect the limited areas we have left that contain beneficial, diverse wildlife in our county. Growth is a wonderful and necessary part of life, but it must be done responsibly and with great care. Please consider abandoning the proposal for Segment C and, instead, utilize the proposed Segment D. Sincerely, Elizabeth Minchey</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
616	2/28/2023	Elizabeth Mulroney	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodland and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Personally, Route C will destroy an area that I have known and loved as a long-time resident of Collin County. If Route C is imposed, we will lose access to community riding arenas, wooded trails, and outdoor pursuits. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable. Please reconsider Route D as the more favorable option when planning the Spur 399 extension. Warm regards,</p> <p>Elizabeth Mulroney                      Teacher, Mother, Citizen                      Allen, Texas                      720-556-6888</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a> . For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.
617	4/20/2023	Elizabeth R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This will cost more money !! Ridiculous funding!	Your comment is noted.
618	4/20/2023	Elizabeth S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly support option B. Oppose option A!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
619	3/9/2023	Elizabeth Timmermann	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Elizabeth Timmermann 500 Rosebury Circle, McKinney Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
620	4/20/2023	Ella D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	US 380 Proposed Route - NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
621	2/26/2023	Ella Di	Email	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
622	2/6/2023	Ella/Dan/Amber Block	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
623	2/25/2023	Elle Walsh	Email	<p>Comment: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B</p> <p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I just don't understand how a proposition that has been thoroughly argued against, destroys a ton of wild life habitats, as well as small businesses and disrupts homes could be picked as the best option. As an educated thinker it does not make any sense and makes me wonder if this was a political decision instead of a decision that has been researched to find the best course of action. Again, as a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Elle Walsh</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
624	3/13/2023	Ellen Landel	Online	<p>We are writing to you to express our opposition to segment "A" of the proposed 380 bypass since segment "B" would be the far more logical route to take. We have lived in Tucker Hill for 6 1/2 years. We live on the upper part of Tremont Blvd. closest to 380. We can see (and hear) the traffic from our driveway (approximately 200 ft. away). We purchased this home from Darling Company as it was the only one on the market in Tucker Hill at the time. We love this neighborhood for the unique architecture and the front porch presentation of each home. Hard to find that in most places of North Texas. Listed below are a few of the reasons we believe "A" is the poorest choice TxDot could make:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Far more expensive from a land acquisition viewpoint, movement of utilities, building a below grade road requiring far greater engineering and material expenses, etc.</li> <li>*Years of traffic disruption between Ridge Rd. and Custer with very few alternatives for the current flow of traffic. Segment "B" would not interfere with traffic on 380.</li> <li>*Far greater environmental impact on this neighborhood as well as Stonebridge on the south side of 380. Tucker Hill would be surrounded on two sides of a major highway subjecting residents to a significant increase in noise and air pollution.</li> <li>*Significant home devaluation particularly to the homes within 500 feet of the construction project. TxDot should be prepared to guarantee that the value of our homes would be made whole.</li> </ul> <p>TxDot has sited one of the reasons "A" was chosen over "B" was that there was more opposition expressed to segment "B". It's unfortunate that the squeaky wheel theory was put into play to make this decision since "B" was so obviously the far better choice from all aspects involved. A therapeutic horse farm should not have decided the fate of the bypass as that entity would not have been as adversely affected as had been publicized. We know, that at this point, we are far from the first bulldozer showing up on 380 and we, therefore, respectfully ask that you reconsider the choice of segment "A" as being the best alternative. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
625	2/16/2023	Ellen Shaunessy	Online	I fully support the findings of the study and the preferred alignment of Segment A. Thank you!	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
626	4/20/2023	Elon Reynolds	Email	<p>Stephen Endres:                      I have a significant concern.                      Per the FHWA, more than 25% of all fatal automobile accidents are directly associated with a highway horizontal curve. The average crash rate on highway horizontal curve segments is approximately three (3) times that of alternative highway segment designs.                      Source:(<a href="https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway_dept/countermeasures/horicurves">https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway_dept/countermeasures/horicurves</a>)                      In 2022, the US Department of Transportation released their National Roadway Safety Strategy which endorsed zero fatalities as the national goal and promotes building safety into every highway segment design.                      Two (2) Opposing 90 Degree Curves with Traffic at Freeway Speeds                      Currently, the TxDOT preferred Alignment A highway segment includes two opposing 90 degree horizontal curves designed to reroute traffic at freeway speeds a full 90 degrees in one direction ...and then to reroute that same traffic at freeway speeds a full 90 degrees in the opposite direction. All this...within less than a two (2) mile highway centerline distance.                      QUESTION: Did TxDOT adequately consider the safety risks, including both injury and fatality, based on the preferred Alignments A highway segment designs vs. Alignment B?                      TxDOT Response: _____                      QUESTION: Based on Alignment A as currently designed, has TxDOT previously 1.) designed, 2.) approved, 3.) constructed and 4.) opened to traffic at freeway speeds a similar highway segment consisting of two opposing 90 degree horizontal curves within less than a two (2) mile highway centerline distance on a designated US Highway anywhere within the State of Texas?                      TxDOT Response: _____                      If YES, 1.) Where, 2.) When, and 3.) What are the historical accident statistics in this/these highway horizontal curve segments with 90 degree opposing curves open to traffic at freeway speeds?                      TxDOT Response: _____                      If NO, I respectfully ask TxDOT to pause the EIS process (FULL STOP) until an expanded TxDOT planning and design effort can be completed to fully anticipate and understand the ramifications of the current TxDOT 'preferred alignment'.                      Regards,                      Elon Reynolds                      7416 Ardmore Street                      McKinney TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points. TxDOT provides a summary of fatal and injury crashes by alternative on page 2-33 of the DEIS.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
627	3/14/2023	Emi Jabara	Email	<p>Dear Mr Endres</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodland and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Personally, Route C will destroy an area that I have known and loved as a long-time resident of Collin County. If Route C is imposed, we will lose access to community riding arenas, wooded trails, and outdoor pursuits. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable. Sincerely,</p> <p>Emi Jabara                      Emi Jabara                      Natural Horsemanship Instructor                      "A horse doesn't care how much you know until he knows how much you care"  <a href="http://www.HarmonyHorsemanship.net">www.HarmonyHorsemanship.net</a></p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
628	2/17/2023	Emily Falk	Online	<p>My home located at 5300 Grove Cove Dr. McKinney, TX backs up to segment E. I was told a noise barrier would not be erected to protect our home from noise pollution. I strongly disagree that we will not be impacted by noise. We currently can hear vehicles both in our backyard and from inside our home. A sound barrier needs to be considered to reduce the increased noise pollution this project will cause. I'm also concerned about the impacts of the emissions from vehicles and the dust from construction. My husband and I recently had a little girl and I'm concerned about her playing outside in our backyard when construction starts due to dust and debris. I look forward to working with you to find solutions to these issues.</p>	<p>Your comment and concern about traffic noise and air quality is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's FHWA-approved Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Heatherwood neighborhood currently has a brick privacy wall or barrier of some type that would reduce noise; therefore, the area does not meet feasibility and reasonableness requirements. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).</p> <p>TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12 and the traffic noise analysis information can be found in Section 3.14.</p>
629	3/15/2023	Emily Grace Morehead	Email	<p>Hello, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Emily Morehead Emily Grace Morehead, MA, LPC</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
630	3/15/2023	Emily McCutchen	Email	Stephen, As a concerned citizen of the area of discussion, I am completely "perplexed" as to this extension...an EIS has been completed, a DEIS has been created and according to process and protocols, as well as, precedence set in almost all "like projects", this one...for some reason continues. I applaud you and all that have diligently worked on this, and I trust that ALL aspects considered have shown proof that the proper route for the Bypass, just East of Tucker Hill will prevail. As has been studied and considered, the Parks and Recreation areas, School and Academic structures, amenities for the Disabled, existing housing for families and seniors, wildlife...all of the above have been "saved" based on the current position. SEGMENT A is truly the proper path... Thank you, Emily McCutchen	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.
631	3/14/2023	Emily O'Brien	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. All my best, Emily O'Brien McKinney, TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
632	3/14/2023	Emily Selin	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Emily Selin 1517 Landon Lane, McKinney, TX 75071 Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
633	4/20/2023	Emily W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A; yes to segment B. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
634	4/12/2023	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Email	<p>Mr. Doug Booher                      Director of Environmental Affairs                      Texas Department of Transportation                      125 East 11th Street                      Austin, Texas 78701                      Re: EPA comment letter for the U.S. Highway 380 McKinney Draft EIS                      Dear Mr. Booher:                      The Region 6 office of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (CEQ No. 20230007) for the U.S. Highway 380 McKinney (US 380) in Collin County, Texas. The Draft EIS was reviewed pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500 – 1508), and by our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The US 380 project proposes to address population growth within the central portion of Collin County, primarily the City of McKinney, that has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and Farm to Market (FM) 1827 (New Hope Road), leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates along US 380 compared to other similar roadways in the region. We have provided the following detailed comments for your consideration. We appreciate the opportunity to review the Draft EIS. If you have any questions on our recommendations, please contact Keith Hayden of my staff at (214) 665-2133 or by e-mail at [REDACTED]. Sincerely,                      Robert Houston                      Staff Director                      Office of Communities, Tribes and Environmental Assessment                      DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE US 380 MCKINNEY DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT                      Environmental Justice and Community Engagement                      EPA recommends that community feedback is reflected in the decision-making process. Designing robust community engagement practices maximizes participation opportunities for communities that would be affected by the project, such as community-based workshops to facilitate discussion and issue resolution. Community-based workshops may also provide an opportunity to identify key issues and milestones for meaningful engagement in the NEPA process for the communities. Below are additional recommendations that will ensure robust community engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide early and frequent outreach and engagement opportunities to collect and incorporate community feedback throughout the NEPA process and to maintain maximum transparency.</li> <li>• Ensure that meetings are scheduled at a time and location that is accessible for community participants, including scheduling meetings after work hours and on weekends as appropriate.</li> <li>• Provide ample notice of meetings and commenting opportunities so that community members have sufficient time to prepare and participate.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Since 2016, TxDOT has provided a robust public outreach and engagement program for this project as part of the prior US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study and since 2019 during the US 380 Schematic and Environmental Study from Coit Road to FM 1827. TxDOT has held multiple rounds of stakeholder and neighborhood workgroup meetings and met regularly with stakeholders such as HOA leaders and local government and agency representatives.</p> <p>All public meetings had scheduled start times after 5 p.m.</p> <p>The project team followed the guidance provided in TxDOT's Public Involvement toolkit and provided a 15-day notice to stakeholders and property owners/residents within a half mile of the project alternatives under consideration during the development of the EIS. Mailed notices were sent in English as well as translated into Spanish and Vietnamese. Ads were also placed in Al Dia, a local Spanish newspaper. Comment forms were made available in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese.</p> <p>All public facing project information was produced with public friendly language. A glossary was provided for the Public Scoping Meeting, Public Meeting, and Public Hearing.</p> <p>TxDOT-established criteria to determine the feasibility (noise reduction) and reasonableness (cost) of proposed noise barriers was applied during the traffic noise analysis to determine which areas would include noise barriers. During project final design, TxDOT will conduct noise workshops with residents in areas affected by traffic noise. The opinions of the affected property owners are vital to the construction of a noise barrier. Even if the traffic noise study in the EIS indicates that a noise barrier is feasible and reasonable, the final decision to build a barrier or to not build a barrier is made by a simple majority vote of the affected property owners. Local officials are also provided copies of the traffic noise study and federal regulations on traffic noise to assist in future land-use planning intended to promote harmony between land development and highways.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote engagement opportunities within appropriate outlets used by affected communities, such as newspapers, radio, and social media.</li> <li>• Ensure that all project-related information is conveyed using plain language so that community members of varied reading proficiencies can readily understand the project-related information.</li> <li>• Continue to share project information with the public in Spanish and Vietnamese, as needed.</li> </ul> <p>Noise</p> <p>The proposed alternatives have noise sensitive receptors (NSR's) and barriers are proposed to mitigate noise impacts to some of the NSR's. Other NSR's will not receive noise mitigation due to cost or feasibility. EPA recommends TxDOT continue to explore potential noise mitigation solutions to reduce impacts to affected NSR's. Also, ensure that NSR's understand the scope of the issue and discuss any potential solutions with them. While noise impacts may not be fully mitigated due to cost, a reduction of noise effects might be feasible, and would be better than no mitigation at all.</p>	

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
635	2/6/2023	Equine Rescue	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D?</p> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
636	2/24/2023	Eric Breznicky	Email	Good Evening, As a McKinney Resident, I am hoping for your support. While I understand there are strong feelings in both directions, I am asking for you to say NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. After a lot of research and thought, I cannot wrap my mind around Option A being a better option. I live a few miles from the proposed route. This is not directly impacting my home, but it will impact the community. I will appreciate the easier access, but Option A doesn't make sense in comparison to Option B. Eric Breznicky	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS.
637	4/20/2023	Eric G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A, YES TO SEGMENT B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
638	3/16/2023	Eric J Adams	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
639	4/20/2023	Eric S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote No to Segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
640	3/16/2023	Erica Esparza	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
641	3/14/2023	Erica Jones	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Erica Jones Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
642	2/6/2023	Erich Uecker	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
643	2/21/2023	Erick Chapman	Online	I am firmly opposed to the Segment E location, that skirts the south side of Erwin Park. Having a 6 lane Hwy plus controlled access lanes will kill the Unique by Nature part of that park. It would no longer be a quiet, serene place. And it would also greatly disrupt the ecology of that area. A much better choice would be further north-along the existing plan for the Collin County Outer Loop.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
644	4/20/2023	Erik B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is more direct, cheaper, and safer- this should be a no brainer!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
645	2/16/2023	Erik Baumgarten	Paper form	It appears that Segments A and B are ranked very closely, but feature a substantial difference that was not considered during the comparison of alternatives. Segment B could be built east-to-west, with minimal impact to U.S. 380 traffic during construction. By comparison, Segment A would necessitate substantially more traffic interruption over a longer period of time, by requiring the tear down of three times as much existing roadway.	Your comment is noted. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.
646	3/2/2023	Erik Baumgarten	Online	In regard to Segment A vs Segment B, the comparison used for the recommendation is deficient because it does not address the impact to traffic on US 380 during the period of construction. Segment B can be built from the northeast to the southwest, with the tie-in to the existing US 380 right of way occurring at the final stage of construction, thus allowing traffic to flow normally for the majority of the project. By comparison, Segment A impacts a much longer extent of existing roadway, necessitating a substantial impact to traffic during the build phase. Since the objective purpose of the project is to alleviate a major traffic bottleneck, the feasibility comparison cannot be complete without a comparison of the impact of the project's execution on the end it pursues. The absence of this comparison in the draft EIS are substantial grounds to revisit the decision.	Your comment is noted. Information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
647	2/22/2023	Erik Gamborg	Online	<p>I attended the public hearing at Rhea's Mill Baptist Church on February 21st. I was immediately taken with just how close section Section A is to our neighborhood, as we live in Timberridge, which is only about a quarter-mile west, just south of Wilmeth. Not only that, but I was told there would be no considerations for a noise barrier for either side of that portion, even though there are three communities, and a school, all within hundreds of feet. If this happens, this area will be very noisy for residents and schools. I am also surprised that Section C was chosen, instead of D, considering the number of homes affected by C. I am opposed to this plan overall, no matter which sections are included, though. It might have been fine five years ago, but with the number of homes affected, this whole thing is a bad idea. Frankly, the best course of action would be to secure the land all around the Outer Loop, and then join the Tollway to 75 using the Outer Loop as the go-between.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project as currently designed would not result in any potential displacement of homes in the Timberridge subdivision.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Timberridge subdivision does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements for a noise barrier.</p> <p>It is also important to note that even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>
648	4/4/2023	Erik Gamborg	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, I sincerely hope you will consider how this will affect those who live in the Timberridge community. The option that would run parallel to Ridge Road will be less than a 1/4 mile from our neighborhood. Unfortunately, it is merely the lesser of two evils because the option that would go through Prosper would take out some of our homes, with mine likely included. If the option that runs parallel to Ridge Road ends up happening, there are no provisions for any sound barriers. Having lived close to a freeway before, sound barriers are vital to adjacent neighborhoods. Even with sound barriers, there is significant noise in the neighborhoods, so I can only imagine what the noise would be like without them. Overall, though, the best option isn't even being discussed, which is to make roads like Wilmeth and Bloomdale four-lane roads all the way across, and then turn the Outer Loop into the alternate to the 380 bypass, connecting it between the Dallas North Tollway and Hwy 75. As residential communities are growing more and more in McKinney, the current 380 bypass options are needlessly overbearing and will destroy too many homes and businesses. Thank you for your time. I understand that these decisions are difficult, but I sincerely hope you will consider how these options will affect these newer communities, with families who are just beginning to lay down roots in the community. Regards, Erik Gamborg</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project as currently designed would not result in any displacement of homes in the Timberridge subdivision.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Timberridge subdivision does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements for a noise barrier.</p> <p>It is also important to note that even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
649	4/20/2023	Ernest T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	B is the best plan for now and the ever increasing future traffic. Spend that \$100M extra for the better plan - B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
650	3/7/2023	Eugene Daunis	Email	Hello, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, Eugene Daunis 1513 Hunters Creek Dr Mckinney, TX 75072 Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device Get Outlook for Android	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
651	4/20/2023	Eugene P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	We don\'t want a major highway bypass right outside our neighbor elementary school!	Your comment is noted. Both Segment A and B would have schools near the proposed right-of-way for this project.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
652	2/6/2023	Eugene/Kristen/Caryss/Aaron/Bethany/Haley/Stephen Haegenauer	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
653	3/15/2023	Fazila Siddiqi	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Fazilasiddiqi Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
654	2/3/2023	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres, Thank you for contacting FEMA for information in reference to your questions pertaining to Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Notice of Public Hearing US380 From Coit Road to FM 1827 CSJs: 0135-02-065, 0135-03-053, 0135-15-002 Collin County, Texas request for information. Please review our attached response.</p> <p>Loukisha Williams WE WOULD REQUEST THAT THE COMMUNITY FLOODPLAIN ADMINISTRATOR BE CONTACTED FOR THE REVIEW AND POSSIBLE PERMIT REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS PROJECT. IF FEDERALLY FUNDED, WE WOULD REQUEST PROJECT TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH EO11988 &amp; EO 11990.</p> <p>Collin County, Texas McKinney, Texas Tracy Homfield Assistant Dir of Engineering Env. Manager 4690 Community Avenue, Suite 200 Tennessee Street McKinney, Texas 75071 Texas 75069 [REDACTED] (972) 548 - 3727 7576 (972) 548 - 5555 Town of Prosper, Texas Dan Heischman Senior Engineer P.O. Box 307 Prosper, Texas 75078 [REDACTED] (972) 569 - 1096 (972) 347 - 9006</p>	<p>TxDOT will continue coordination with the FEMA local floodplain administrator, W. Kyle Odom, CFM, RS – City of McKinney, through any further refinement of the Preferred Alternative including final design. Pier placement within the floodplain along with options to span floodways may be refined to further minimize hydraulic impacts and further minimize the need for compensatory flood storage. The use of bridged or elevated sections beyond the East Fork Trinity River area versus the use of earthen fill embankment would continue to be evaluated in consideration of project costs versus impacts to wetlands and streams, to protect the natural and beneficial values of floodplains, and reduce the project’s hydraulic effect on the stream system. The DEIS (Sections 3.10.7.1 and 33.2) describes how the project would comply with EOs 11988 and 11990, respectively.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
655	3/8/2023	Felipe Cowley	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Thank you Felipe Cowley Stonebridge Ranch Resident since 1996</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
656	4/20/2023	Ferdinand T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Segment B is less disruptive and cheaper. Segment A does not make sense.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
657	2/6/2023	Fond Memories	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D?</p> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
658	2/17/2023	Francisco Durán	Email	Hello, I also support of Route D, which goes through the flood plain and disrupts 7 homes as opposed to the 29 homes on Route C. This property is a community resource (Therapeutic riding, church and community riding and events etc). Route C is affecting us in so many ways. Please your consideration with this. Thank you!	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).
659	4/20/2023	Frank A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
660	2/17/2023	Frank DeLizza	Online	I am still very strongly opposed to Alt A vs Alt B. Alt A has a lower level of service and higher travel time than B A costs \$200 Million more than B, That's \$200 million of our tax dollars. I thought TXDOT was supposed to be good stewards of our money. There are many current noise receptors in A, not potential future noise receptors, Noise mitigation measures in A are inadequate and do not address the whole problem. The noise issue is a whitewash at best, B favors developers, not current residents and taxpayers. A has significantly less impact om wetlands, forests and grasslands and statewide important farmland In 48 years of engineering I have participated in many DEIS and EIS projects and never seen one favor developers as much as this.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Development impacts would potentially occur if either Segment A or B were constructed. Details can be found in the Segment Analysis Matrix at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> and Appendix S of the DEIS which outlines indirect and cumulative effects of the project.  A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A noise barrier near the provided address does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
661	2/19/2023	Frank DeLizza	Online	Evaluating the noise impact of Alternative A based on a 60 mph speed is a fatal flaw. The geometry will support traffic at greater than 60 mph, and looking at the speeds on similar roads, speeds in excess of 70 - 75 mph can readily be anticipated. The noise impact study must be run at the higher speeds, not 60 mph. We can reasonably expect the posted speed limit to be raised to 70 mph given TXDOT's history in similar projects.	Your comment and concern about noise impacts are noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Future build noise levels on Segment A were predicted for the year 2050 at a speed of 70 mph. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.
662	2/17/2023	Frank DeLizza	Online (2)	I am still very strongly opposed to Alt A vs Alt B. Alt A has a more significant impact on the La Cima community at Stonebridge. Alt A is more expensive. Alt A will significantly decrease property values for current residents, not future residents. Future Prosper residents can see the highway before they buy and make an informed decision. Current residents are having property values reduced without due process or compensation. The current design for the Custer intersection is dangerous and also prohibits east-west traffic on the access roads. This alternative provides no real benefit to this community, just disruption, noise, visual impact and inconvenience, and destruction of our right to a peaceful existence. We are current McKinney taxpayers, not Prosper future taxpayers or developers.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.
663	2/14/2023	Frank DeLizza, PE	Online	This DEIS is seriously flawed in several ways: Alternative B should have been the preferred alternative not A. A is more expensive. A has significantly more noise impact, which is unmitigated. A has a horrific and unmitigable visual impact on the La Cima community, park and lake, the view across the lake will be of a concrete monstrosity with trucks speeding over it. A will cause a very significant loss of jobs in the 380/Custer area, which has not been addressed. A will cause a significant deterioration of property values in the La Cima and other neighborhoods. Future property values in Prosper will benefit, while McKinney property values will suffer. Future buyers in Prosper to be aware of the construction and impact, so they can make an informed decision on purchasing. La Cima and nearby residents have no choice about this seizure of our properties. The entrance to Stonebridge ranch will be seriously degraded. The aerial intersection at 380/Custer will be an unsightly eyesore..	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a> .  A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by value associated with site specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee which of these impacts will impact the value of the subject property in a negative or positive way.</p> <p>TxDOT does not anticipate any displacements of residences or seizure of properties in the LaCima neighborhood or damages from the project to any Stonebridge Ranch entrance. TxDOT is proposing a grade-separation and intersection at US 380 and Stonebridge Drive along with entrance and exit ramps upstream and downstream of the intersection to provide efficient access to Stonebridge Ranch.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Regarding the future US 380 and Custer Road interchange, TxDOT continues to work on refining the design in this area. TxDOT anticipates 11 potential direct business displacements near the interchange. TxDOT will review the displacement count during the development of the FEIS. TxDOT ROW agents also offer relocation assistance.</p>
664	2/28/2023	Frank DeLizza, PE	Online	<p>Submitted via 380 DEIS website Mr, Stephen Endres, PE, Mr. Mohamed K. Bur, PE RE: US380 DEIS It seems that the latest 2022 scoping comments, and mine in particular, were not included in the DEIS. I know I had turned them in online. In fact, there seems to be no comments from that go around. I hope they'll be included in the FEIS so a well-informed final decision can be reached.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
665	3/16/2023	Frank Etier	Online	I understand the need for some relief on Hwy 380 for current and future traffic capacity. I live in Tucker Hill and feel that the option that passes directly in front of our neighborhood is the worst possible option. Option B would disrupt the least amount of business and homes and cost millions less. Please revisit all available options and select Option B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
666	3/9/2023	Frank McCafferty	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Frank McCafferty 8100 Blue Hole Ct McKinney, TX 75070	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
667	3/16/2023	Fred Costa	Email	Stephen, USE SEGMENT A, TXDOT PREFERRED ALIGNMENT. Are you in the pocket of the mayor of McKinney? I have personally been polite to you, but my patience is growing thin. What happened, you didn't get the answer your master wanted the first 4 times you asked that question? You're still asking? Understand TXDOT will never put a bypass in PROSPER. McKinney has fast tracked building permits for businesses on Segment A. That FACT will easily be proved in court. Invoice McKinney for the new utility costs on Segment A. The corruption in McKinney's city council has earned it. They should have agreed to expanding 380 on 380. If TxDOT had engineers on staff, you would have advised McKinney of that fact. Stay out of Prosper or see you in court. Fred Costa 260 Burnet Ct Prosper TX 75078	Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which does include Segment A.
668	2/22/2023	G Bailey	Comment Form	This is just a dog and pony show. The decision to go with the "Blue" plan is already in motion. Blue plan is disruptive . Segment A runs right around Tucker Hill development. Using the "Gold plan" makes more use of under developed land and goes furtjer out from residential areas. Bring in the by-pass out west of Coit Rd so you can utilize more farmland so its less disruptive to residential are. We oppose C segment as well. This whole thing is a political mess.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
669	3/1/2023	G Nguyen	Online	Hello. I am writing to voice my opinion for choosing OPTION B. B is a far better solution for the city of McKinney. It is beyond reason that OPTION A, a route so close to residential neighborhoods, is the current front runner. Not only will OPTION A cause increased noise and traffic to Tucker Hill, one of the city's most unique neighborhoods, it will be far more expensive. The Tucker Hill neighborhood pool was exponentially more expensive than planned because of the bedrock that lies below the soil. It is truly absurd that McKinney continues to stand behind the slogan "Unique by Nature" and then suggests bulldozing a neighborhood's green space and disrupting a residential area. B is less expensive and will cause less of an environmental, noise, and traffic impact. It's clear that some residences' voices are louder than others. Namely those owning a horse ranch (and formally a builder). And this is unconscionable. OPTION B is clearly the better choice. A should no longer be considered.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a> .  Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix. Our comparison of Segments A and B showed that there was not a substantial difference in traffic metrics such as travel times, travel speeds, and Level of Service.
670	2/22/2023	G Ray	Online	Please stick to the route you have selected. It's time to get this project going.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
671	2/18/2023	G.M.	Online	Our community is in support of Segment A as logical and reasonable. In regards to the Custer / 380 intersection, the proposed change for a traditional intersection is preferred over the current "rope weave" concept. However, we ask that you consider additional turn lanes as there is a substantial amount of traffic that turns from Custer Road to 380 (to travel both west and east on 380).	Your comment, support of the project, and request for an additional turn lane is noted. TxDOT continues to work on the design for the future US 380 and Custer Road intersection with the City of McKinney. TxDOT is still considering other design opportunities to improve traffic operations at the US 380 and Custer Road intersection. Multiple turn lanes for each movement for the traditional interchange design is one of the design options considered.
672	4/20/2023	Gail L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	B is more cost effective and saves so much residential and business disruption.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.
673	4/20/2023	Gail P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
674	3/7/2023	Gail Peter Wong	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Gail Peter Wong 1808 Van Landingham Mckinney, TX 75071	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
675	4/20/2023	Gail R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO! TO SEGMENT A . . . Period!!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
676	3/16/2023	Gail Weiland	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
677	4/20/2023	Garrett H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
678	2/17/2023	Gary and Beth Hatch	Online	We see that Erwin Farms has proposed noise barriers and looking at the proposed route C on Bloomdale there are no noise barriers for the Heatherwood subdivision on the south side of the proposed route between Lake Forest and Ridge. We strongly recommend sound barriers for this portion of the road to benefit our residents and quality of life.	Your comment and concern about traffic noise is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Heatherwood neighborhood currently has a brick privacy wall or barrier of some type that would reduce noise; therefore the area does not meet feasibility and reasonableness requirements. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.
679	4/20/2023	Gary C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	We support Segment B. It make more sense in the long term.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
680	4/20/2023	Gary K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	If Proposal A is used I am very concerned about an increase of traffic thru Stonebridge Ranch development on Lake Forest , Ridge Road and Stonebridge Drive all of which have elementay schools on them inside our community	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
681	3/16/2023	Gary Lauman	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
682	4/20/2023	Gary M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is the best solution for price, duration and closures!!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
683	3/10/2023 3/9/2023	Gary Metzler	Online (1) Email (1)	I am a resident of Tucker Hill and my family adamantly opposes the Segment A preference by TxDOT. The justification is faulty. In your early correspondence, it was clear that Segment B would cost less, was less distance and closed fewer businesses. Taking the alternative route NORTH of 380 farther west is the RIGHT way to proceed. My home and family will suffer being burdened with this "Super Highway" on two sides. Loud, busy and dirty. Main Gate was obviously the biggest advocate of Segment A, but you already conducted a thorough study that determined they would NOT be adversely impacted. I also have a special needs child living in Tucker hill and this bypass should be shifted into the rural north Segment B. What about our home values? We will be forced to leave this community. McKinney needs to stand up to TxDOT and Prosper and make this change! Respectfully, Gary, Stacy and Chloe Metzler 7512 Hanover Street Tucker Hill	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.  Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.  While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
684	4/20/2023	Gary R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am a Stonebridge Ranch resident and I oppose Segment A and agree with Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
685	2/17/2023	Gary Sanders	Online	I support route D 100% I protest the selection of C as it is a much larger negative effect on Humans, Wild life, forest, woodlands, Mother Nature, Mother Earth. D only effects a few RENT HOUSES and modular homes on little pieces of land as it appears to me. Segment A was selected due to its minimal impact to residents and future development. Segment D should be selected for the same reasons.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
686	1/18/2023	Gary Talley	Email	Re:US380 Coit Road to FM1827 in Collin County, Tx Mr. Stephen Endres, Will Independence Parkway be extended to connect to the proposed service road? Appreciate your response in advance! Thank you! Gary Talley 214-878-7392 Email addresses: [REDACTED]	Email response from TxDOT on 1/18/2023:  It is planned to be. It is not a TxDOT project. It would be a city project.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
687	4/20/2023	Gary W. Sanders	Email	<p>Sent from my I Gary Sanders Protest and oppose the selection of route C 100% as it is massive destruction to everything important in my relationship with life. I know it's a wrong decision as I have talked personally with over 2000 people and 100% of them preferred D minimal destruction NOT ONE PERSON AGREES WITH C! I eliminated all the dots on the map that are people and businesses that chose to be on a highway. When I then look at it I get SICK because so much destruction that is unnecessary to all that's important to life on route C on Route D nothing except for a small group of rental houses that can be replaced in any small community in Texas. Ranches are unique y'all have drawn through 6 ranches in 4/10 of mile when there is 2 miles of vacant land across the street, move it on the west side of Fm2933 where you won't destroy or disrupt the retirement ranches of senior citizens.. obviously I am not an engineer or an expert but I do know RIGHT FROM WRONG! I took a pledge in 1966 that I still carry: Conservation Pledge which says I give my pledge as an American to save and faithfully to DEFEND from waste the natural resources of my country- it's soil and minerals, it's forest, waters and wildlife. I still live by that My opinion is the decision that seems to be the choice of only TxDOT is THE MOST DESTRUCTIVE ROUTE THAT COULD BE CHOSEN. I won't post all the numbers of destruction and comparisons I know y'all probably have them memorized. I plead with you to do what is right. It's Gods Earth and our job to respect it just as our bodies. PLEASE ALWAYS REMEMBER IT WAS THE BEST ENGINEERS THAT BUILT THE TITANIC!!! IT WAS THE COMMON MAN THAT BUILT NOAH'S ARK!!!! Signed, The common man Gary W. Sanders 2500 FM 2933 McKinney, Tx 75071 214-986-1537</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.</p> <p>It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Regarding moving the Segment C alignment, TxDOT developed the alignment to maximize the existing right-of-way from FM 2933 and minimize direct impact on local businesses along CR 332.</p>
688	3/15/2023	Gary Williams	Email	<p>To whom it may concern, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Gary Williams</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
689	4/20/2023	Gay H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A -YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
690	4/20/2023	Gaye L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I believe segment A is NOT the right choice. B is better for ourMcKinney community.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
691	4/20/2023	George B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
692	2/25/2023	George Bouhasin	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, George Bouhasin	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
693	3/19/2023	George E and Barbara A Dupont	Online	We are in support of TX DOT's recommended highway/380 By-Pass location along Segments A, E, and C. We live in Prosper less than 0.5 miles west of FM 2478/Custer Road and 0.5 miles south of FM 1461/Frontier Parkway. As such, segments A and E represent the BEST solution for location of the 380 By-Pass for Prosper as well as McKinney. Based upon feedback from some home/land owners along Segment C we would only ask that Tx DOT does it due diligence to insure that it also selects the BEST alternative between C and D for both the land/home owners, the neighborhoods, Collin County, and the State. Based upon what we know (and we don't live along Segment C), we would support Tx DOT on Segment C also after farther investing any other alternatives between Segment C and Segment D. George and Barbara Dupont 1400 Harvest Ridge Lane Prosper, TX 75078	Your comment and support of Segments A and E is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. The project team analyzed the areas around Segments C and D through multiple in-person field visits where Right of Entry (ROE) was granted, use of aerial imagery/maps, and existing databases including Collin County Appraisal District listings.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
694	2/9/2023	George Mavros and Karina Olevsky	Email	Public Comment Submission for: US 380 From Coit Road to FM 1827 CSJs: 0135-02-065, 0135-03-053, 0135-15-002 Collin County, Texas Name: George Mavros and Karina Olevsky Residence: 1013 Hoyt Drive, McKinney, TX 75071 (just north of proposed project) Hi Mr. Endres, Per the instructions on the TX DOT website regarding this project, kindly consider this email to constitute a Public Comment submission. We would like to go on record supporting Segment D of the proposed plans and opposing Segment C of the proposed plan. Compared to Segment C, we believe Segment D will: disrupt less residents and businesses, preserve more of the natural forest and wildlife we enjoy seeing in the area, disturb less wetlands and would be better for traffic than Segment C. Thank you. Please let us know if you require any additional information. Confirmation of receipt would be greatly appreciated. George and Karina	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
695	4/20/2023	George R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Plan B should be chosen because it is less expensive than plan A and less disruptive to businesses and homes. We are also hearing the bypass will be moved 900 feet closer to Tucker Hill. Seems like two large developers are influencing TXDOT into making decisions favorable to their properties and detrimental to McKinney citizens.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.  The Segment A shift that was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.
696	4/20/2023	Gerald B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Plan A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
697	4/20/2023	Gerald S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A, Yes to B !!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
698	4/19/2023	Gerald Sweet	Email	<p>I am a resident of Stonebridge in McKinney, Tx. I am in full support of your proposed Segment B for the bypass on US 380. I am very opposed to segment A of the proposed 380 expansion. B is at least \$150 million less than A and that is before the following possible additional expenses based on your presentation. Cost could increase with the relocation of water lines in front of the McKinney water tanks. There are two dams that A would bisect and from your presentation you currently don't know what issues or cost would be involved with them. Depressing 380 in front of Tucker Hill might be more costly due to the higher water table (again bisecting the dams). Once started there could be more potential problems with environmental cleanup on 2 business sites with the A route and none on the B route.</p> <p>Option A displaces more current business and current residential than B. You talk about future residential developments that MAY BE be impacted with B but there are CURRENT residents of both Stonebridge and Tucker Hill that will be impacted. I have an autistic grandson that lives in Tucker Hill. Sounds are especially problematic. What sound studies have been done to limit the amount of noise? When were those studies done? Dates, Times, Weather conditions? Where were the sensors located? B will not have an effect on Main Gait by your own research that you publicized in spring 2022. What factors changed your mind since you now say it will? B does not go through the middle of Prosper and will leave intact at least 15 of their business. Fully Support Segment B!</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. There are no impacts to existing dams within the proposed right-of-way for the project. The proposed Segment A does cross two NRCS soil conservation reservoirs. The proposed Segment B would partially impact the spillway for an existing dam.</p> <p>The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, in addition to extending the existing noise wall. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise levels were predicted out to 500 feet from the edge of proposed right-of-way. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. Details of the traffic noise analysis and location of the noise receivers can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS. The receiver locations are on page 76.</p> <p>Regarding future developments, there are both residential and commercial developments under construction and being planned along Segments A and B. Those that TxDOT was made aware of prior to the Public Hearing are shown on the Segment Analysis Matrix with their development status and the development heat map exhibit available on the Public Hearing website. Many future homes that are currently under construction in the Ladera residential development would have been directly impacted by Segment B. Due to the rapidly changing nature of developments as they go through local planning processes, TxDOT only classified a development as future displacements if the development is expected to be occupied by the anticipated ROD date.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
699	4/20/2023	Gerene G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please implement Segment B for the US380 Bypass project. I strongly oppose Segment A. Segment B costs less and provides the least disruption to residents of McKinney.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
700	3/28/2023	Gerene Gramlich	Email	Hi Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for accepting input from area homeowners. Regards, Gerene Gramlich 3601 Rottino Drive McKinney, TX 75070	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
701	3/16/2023	Gina Alfero	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
702	4/20/2023	Gina F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Stop wasting taxpayer money! Choose B!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
703	3/22/2023	Gina Fuller	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Please listen to us! This option will ruin our community. Gina Fuller	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
704	3/29/2023	Gina Fuller	Email	<p>Great, thanks for the update. We appreciate you listening and reviewing all of our input! I appreciate all you do, but I have had a very difficult time understanding why TXDOT chose the much more expensive route which comes just east of Stonebridge Drive. How did Prosper win out? (Was it that their mayor had a bigger voice? Bill Darling? I don't know? ) Does the state always choose the most expensive option? I don't think so. I am very frustrated with the elected leaders in McKinney. This route will destroy Stonebridge, Tucker Hill and all the other businesses along this route. I also have a difficult time understanding why Segment C was selected over Segment D since C impacts more homes. I think our Mayor has sold out all the citizens of McKinney to achieve his agenda for the airport and his other developments. "They made the decision, so now we're trying to figure out how best to move forward." George Fuller. Will you please explain this to me and the other citizens who are going to be impacted by our mayor's weak response?</p> <p>Gina Fuller</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
705	3/1/2023	Girlie Candela	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Girlie Candela</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>
706	4/19/2023	Glenn R. and Cynthia L. Goodwin	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing to you on my and my wife's behalf to express our extreme disagreement and displeasure with TXDOT's preliminary decision to choose Option A as the preferred route for a proposed bypass of Highway 380. We have attached a very thorough response prepared by one of our neighbors, and we agree with everything said in that letter. We will not belabor the point by repeating everything said therein, but direct you to its contents as an accurate description of our position on TXDOT's preliminary decision. Instead, we will merely mention a couple of points that were either missed in that letter or not highlighted enough to convey our true feelings. The first point is that we feel the preliminary decision, choosing Option A, is incredibly short-sighted and will do little to achieve the goal of limiting traffic on 380. I moved to McKinney in July 2010 for work, and my wife and I bought a lot in Tucker Hill that August to begin building the home in which we now live. We closed on the house and moved in around the beginning of April 2011. At that time, I was commuting west on 380 and south on the DNT to get to my workplace in Plano. Once I got beyond the Walmart on Custer and 380, there was very little development all the way to the DNT. I saw fields on both sides of the road, covered with hay bales and a morning mist. We both know how much of that land is now developed; there is barely a field left. The same holds true if one continues west of the DNT toward Denton. With all that growth, there is no question that N. Texas needs a bypass north of 380. The problem with Option A for the bypass is that it won't accomplish what is needed. Development continues at a very fast pace between Tucker Hill and DNT and beyond. Within just a couple</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>years, we'll have the PGA and Universal adding to congestion as well. So, building a bypass that travels south to meet 380 east of Tucker Hill is an exercise in futility. If TXDOT began the project today, it would be useless by the time it's finished. If it begins construction in a few years as is contemplated, the bypass's use in decreasing 380 traffic will be like throwing a pebble in the ocean. In fact, TXDOT should not even be considering a bypass route that reconnects with 380 anywhere east of DNT. The more forward-thinking decision would be to have the northern bypass not turn south until it hits I-35 in Denton. Anything west of that will simply be too little, too late, and a tremendous waste of taxpayers' money. The second point we wish to emphasize concerns the more recent idea of moving Option A even further west, but still east of Tucker Hill, ostensibly to allow more room for the development of a proposed apartment complex immediately east of Tucker Hill. Given what I've said above, it should be no surprise that we object to this idea as well. As noted in the attached letter, choosing Option A over Option B (or, more ideally, an even more westerly route) gives preference to future developments over existing residents in Tucker Hill, many of whom have lived here even longer than our 12+ years. That makes absolutely no sense. And to push Option A even closer to our neighborhood suffers from the same fault of logic and common sense; it gives preference to a developer and future short-term, transient apartment renters over existing long-term homeowners in Tucker Hill. How Option A has even been considered in the past is beyond me, and that's before one considers the many arguments, comments and questions contained in the attached letter regarding the cost and impact of Option A vs. Option B. In short, my wife and I strongly object to TXDOT's preference for Option A, and we request that TXDOT reconsider that choice carefully before reaching a final decision. Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.</p> <p>Sincerely,                      Glenn R. Goodwin                      Cynthia L. Goodwin                      7101 Edgerton Way                      McKinney, TX 75071</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	
707	3/8/2023	Glenna Lowe	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am again reaching out to you regarding the 380 Bypass that is being proposed to go through a heavily populated and occupied area (by both residents and businesses) in McKinney. I STRONGLY OPPOSE the Segment A option (380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827) and strongly support the Segment B option. I have been a McKinney resident for over 30 years and the Segment A option will cause untold damages to the Stonebridge Ranch lifestyle, the Tucker Hill community and disrupt thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I find the differences between Segment A and Segment B numerous.</p> <p>1) Segment A will impact the citizens and businesses along 380 disproportionately compared to primarily open and less populated areas in</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Right-of-way acquisition estimates were calculated using Collin County Appraisal District as a guide to come up with square footage cost. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970,</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>Segment B.</p> <p>a) Segment A destroys 27 businesses, 12 displacements and 2 homes currently.</p> <p>b) Segment B destroys NO businesses, 7 displacements and 5 homes.</p> <p>2) Segment B construction will cost less money and impact fewer residents, land owners and businesses.</p> <p>a) Segment A acquisition cost is estimated to be \$69 million dollars higher than Segment B.</p> <p>b) This is before cost overruns.</p> <p>3) Segment B will reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents.</p> <p>a) TxDOT is expecting the City of McKinney to pay \$120 million for right of way acquisitions.</p> <p>b) This is an unplanned tax on the citizens of this City.</p> <p>c) This amount will likely increase significantly due to the number of businesses and residents involved.</p> <p>I realize there are some very influential "forces" that oppose the Segment B option, but the logical and economical option is Segment B. It is less costly and impacts NO businesses, fewer residents and land owners. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you.</p> <p>Glenna Lowe 6604 Spring Wagon Dr McKinney, Texas 75071 214-693-4127</p>	<p>as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,</li> <li>-depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and</li> <li>-providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</li> </ul>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
708	3/16/2023	Gloria Redwine	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
709	2/21/2023	Gordon Bius	Online	<p>Gordon &amp; Cathy Bius 14055 Red Oak Circle N</p> <p>We are concerned about the escalation of highway noise, so we are requesting a noise barrier behind our addition, ie wall, etc.</p>	<p>Your comment and concern about traffic noise and air quality is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including in your area. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p>
710	2/18/2023	Gordon Crowe	Online	<p>"I believe option "A" best choice for bypass around McKinney"</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
711	2/16/2023	Gordon O'Neal	Online	<p>Option C will be a disaster for our neighborhood and the environment. C divides our neighborhood, splits our road, and separates property from owners.</p> <p>D is a better choice. The floodplain where D would go is less valuable than the land encompassed by Option C, which is almost all valuable building sites well away from flooding.</p> <p>C will cross some of the last heavily wooded property near McKinney. It will destroy the habitats of deer, otters, beaver, raccoons, bobcats, and more. It will cross a wetland where ducks and geese winter every year.</p> <p>No one has even walked the land where C will cross, but have only studied aerial photos and maps which do not convey the actual habitats. C is the worse choice. D is much better.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. The project team analyzed the areas around Segments C and D through multiple in-person field visits where Right of Entry (ROE) was granted, use of aerial imagery/maps, and existing databases including Collin County Appraisal District listings.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
712	2/6/2023	Gordon/Margaret O'Neal	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
713	2/17/2023	GR M	Online	As a Collin County resident, I support the Brown Alternative (segments B-E-C) also publicly-supported by the City Council of the City of McKinney. In my view, this alternative will be the best in terms of a solution that will be workable many years longer in this high-growth area of the State of Texas than the A-E-C alternative, involve only marginally more property owner displacements while allowing for a faster commute through the area for the tens of thousands of vehicles that will use this. Please reconsider and select the City-preferred alignment of B-E-C. Thank you for your consideration.	Your comment and support of the Brown Alternative is noted.
714	2/6/2023	Grady Prince	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives</li> <li>Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
715	3/7/2023	Graeme Peart	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
716	4/20/2023	Graham W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	\$100M More expensive (!?); uproot and impact EXISTING businesses and homes v. PLANNED; ignores established noise pollution and its fallout; Stonebridge, Tucker Hill, Auburn Hills, and more affected negatively; school bus routes and daily traffic entry / exit points impacted... "A" seems like a suspicious choice.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.
717	4/20/2023	Graham Weedon	Email	<p>Dear Sir, please see the attached document containing mine and my neighbor's observations and objections to the propose Segment A Bypass. Thank you, Graham Weedon 214-287-9270</p> <p><i>Attached comment and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Attached comment and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
718	4/20/2023	Grayson L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I absolutely oppose Segment A and prefer Segment B for displacement, tax & financial, and environmental reasons. Segment B is better for both the McKinney and Prosper communities in the long-term.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
719	3/15/2023	Greg Baumli	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, I am a resident of Whitley Place (3661 Spicewood Dr.) in Prosper, Texas. I fully support the finding of the DEIS study in finding Segment A to be the preferred alternative for Highway 380. Segment A would preserve the following resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mane Gait</li> <li>• Ladera of Prosper</li> <li>• Founders Academy</li> <li>• Malabar Hills Residential Community</li> <li>• Walnut Grove High School</li> </ul> <p>I support Segment A. Regards Greg Baumli 3661 Spicewood Drive Prosper, TX 75078 847-722-1640</p>	Your comment, support of Segment A, and opposition of Segment B is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which does not include Segment B.
720	4/20/2023	Greg F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Solution B is a far superior route than solution A. Less impact on effected homes and property and less expensive	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
721	2/22/2023	Greg Ishmael	Online	We strongly oppose Route C and want it changed back to Route D.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
722	2/22/2023	Greg Klement	Online	Our family and business support using option B. It cost less, it shorter and will get traffic further away from the bottleneck of 380 & 75. Option A will just move the problem a few miles from Hwy 380 & 75 to Ridge & Hwy 380.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
723	4/20/2023	Greg R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A, yes to B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
724	4/20/2023	Greg S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A. B effects fewer CURRENT and future residences plus is \$200,000,000.00 less. by every matrix TXDOT used, B is less impactful then A.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
725	3/9/2023	Greg Sarro	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, adversely impact fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I respectfully request that you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Greg Sarro 1909 Fieldstone Court McKinney TX 75072 Mobile (214) 697-0302</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
726	3/13/2023	Greg Sweet	Email	<p>I would like to request an extension of the comment period for TXDOT'S proposed 380 bypass route We need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A.</p> <p>Greg Sweet</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
727	4/17/2023	Greg Sweet	Email	<p>I am a resident of McKinney, Tx and a homeowner in Tucker Hill Development. I want to strongly SUPPORT segment B of the proposed 380 expansion. As a resident of TH we only have 2 exits from our neighborhood, both out to 380. Any construction for 3-5 years in front of our neighborhood would severely impact our safety. What safeguards will be implemented should you proceed with A for our community during construction? Emergency vehicle response times would be greatly increased. This also would continue based on your drawing of what segment A would look like as any emergency vehicle coming from the west would have to go beyond TH and if we had to go east to Baylor hospital we would have to head west first. How is TxDOT going to address this issue also during the construction phase? We have been hearing for 7 years that Stonebridge is going to be extended but still has not so no guarantees that it will be prior to construction. Is this something TxDOT will take a proactive approach on? Further, your own matrix shows the number of businesses, residents, and other displacements to be less with B. Cost is much less, nearly \$150m, with your current estimates with B. You even state it could go higher with the utility rerouting. Environmental impact is even less with option B. Segment A could have a potential high-risk EPA clean up where B has zero. These are all things from your own study. There are numerous other issues and questions with regard to the study used to base your decision. I have attached a copy of all issues and supported references. What study has TxDOT done to show the full impact of air quality both during and after construction? Where were those monitors located? What dates and times were collected during this study? What list of assumptions did TxDOT use in regards to weather etc during this study? I would also like the above questions answered for the sound study that was done in Tucker Hill. Why are there no plans to put up sound barriers on the north side (Tucker Hill) but on the south side (Stonebridge)? Prevailing winds are from the south and we would be affected most. Segment A consists of 2 90 degree turns. What studies have been done on the safety of those as compared to the gradual lane shift in B?</p> <p>Greg Sweet 7604 Townsend Blvd McKinney, Tx 75071</p> <p><i>Attached comment and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.</p> <p><i>Attached comment and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
728	3/7/2023	Greg Tappert	Email	<p>As a homeowner and resident of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to choose Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Greg Tappert 608 Rough Creek Drive McKinney, TX 75071-6429 972-741-3363</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
729	3/14/2023	Gregg Payne	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Gregg Payne</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
730	3/15/2023	Gregg Swartz	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, I am writing to submit my thoughts on the proposed 380 bypass. I have previously submitted an email to you voicing my strong opposition to the B route, which would have gone through Prosper, close to our home in Whitley Place, and disrupted traffic at the new high school and the Founders' Academy and disturbed and disrupted the operations of Mane Gait Equine Therapy. We are still strongly opposed to this Option B, and I ask that it never be reconsidered. My first preference is to have the No Build Alternative for the 380 bypass. However, if this is not feasible, then I am in support of the proposed Blue Alternative (A, E, and C route), as I believe this route would cause the least disruption to the existing communities and overall environment. Thank you for allowing me to comment.</p> <p>Gregg Swartz Group Manager, EV Infrastructure &amp; Business Strategy EV Charging Solutions Toyota Motor North America +1 (310) 480-8632 Mobile +1 (469) 292-4927 Office [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment B, and support of the No-Build Alternative and the Blue Alternative is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
731	4/20/2023	Gregory T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A! YES to Segment B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
732	4/20/2023	Gregory Y	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I support segment B of the proposed US 380 route.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
733	2/17/2023	Gretchen Adams	Online	I'm against C and prefer D.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
734	4/20/2023	Gretchen B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
735	2/23/2023	Gretchen Stofer Darby	Email	Hi Stephen, I wanted to formally submit my support for the current plan to keep 380 on 380 through Prosper. Thanks so much. Gretchen	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
736	3/16/2023	Gwendolyn Pobanz	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
737	3/21/2023	H Alexander Johnson	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment B for the US 380 Bypass. I strongly urge you to implement Segment A as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass. H Alexander Johnson 6101 GREYWALLS DR McKinney, TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
738	3/31/2023	H H	Online	As a resident of Tucker Hill, I oppose route A and support Route B. Currently, Segment A includes a below-grade design only "generally considered to help with mitigating noise impacts." TxDOT must do better. Tucker Hill will bear a greater burden of this community's needs due to visual and noise impacts from that direction as well. If a bypass of 380 is the objective, what traffic is being bypassed when the route is in line with the current roadway? Instead, Tucker Hill will become more difficult to access, with one entry point that leads to an 8-lane highway - below. Please do not protect the future development of Propser while ignoring this unique, and incomplete, development in McKinney. Should Segment A move forward, please consider adjustments to extend Stonebridge Ranch to allow West access to Tuck Hill. Please include more noise abatement measures as well.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.  In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.  TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.
739	4/18/2023	H Johnson	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment B for the US 380 Bypass. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment A as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass Furthermore we oppose the roundabout at Ridge and Glenn Oaks. Absolutely NO NEEDED H Johnson	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.  TxDOT does not have jurisdiction over any local government project including one at Ridge Road and Glenn Oaks.
740	2/17/2023	H Norton	Online	We oppose route C as it takes more ag land from farmers and ranchers than the alternate route, D. However, both routes will merge and dump a tremendous amount of traffic in Princeton, which just moves the problem further east. There should be a continuous northern route that encompasses Princeton as well. These routes also forget entirely the city of New Hope, which will now become an island with no clear way of entering or leaving the city. It will eventually erase this small paradise in Collin County. McKinney is no longer unique by nature....there is no more nature, and we are becoming Plano.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT is also conducting a schematic design and environmental study for US 380 in Princeton. Routes being considered include a new location freeway to the north of Princeton. More information about that project can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a> .



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
741	4/4/2023 4/5/2023	Hailey Innes	Email (2)	<p>Senator Paxton, Representative Leach, and Mr. Endres: I strongly oppose Segment C and support Segment D. It is easy to look at the map and see how many more homes, businesses, and community services are destroyed or negatively affected by Segment C. I'm also very concerned about the environmental impact to the largest forest in central Collin County. I do not want the wetlands impacted by a large highway. I totally oppose Segment C and support Segment D. Thank you for your representation, Hailey Innes, MS, LPC</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p>
742	2/25/2023	Hannah Miller	Online	Option B is less expensive and safer than Option A. TxDOT should reconsider and implement Segment B.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
743	4/20/2023	Hannah P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The noise pollution this would cause to our exceptional community would be almost impossible to live with. Hundreds of homes will be negatively impacted by this decision.	Your comment is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
744	3/28/2023	Hany Hassan	Email	Hello Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Hany Hassan	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
745	2/24/2023	Hari Bikkina	Online	I live in Bloomridge community which is falling immediate next to the proposed highway. We decided to buy home in this community even though it's remote is for its calmness and peacefulness. I agree that there should be development but not such a big highly next to my home. This will increase traffic, noise levels, rush. We strongly appear this coming in bloomdale road. Please consider an alternative route which will keep McKinney city environment safe and calm	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.
746	3/16/2023	Harli M. Dollinger	Email	Dear Sir - I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodland and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Personally, Route C will destroy an area that I have known and loved as a long-time resident of Collin County. If Route C is imposed, we will lose access to community riding arenas, wooded trails, and outdoor pursuits. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable. I fully support Route D on the Spur 399 extension in Collin County. Many Thanks for Your Attention to this Matter, Harli M. Dollinger, Ph.D.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. This US 380 EIS project and the Spur 399 Extension project are separate projects with independent utility. Both Segments C and D can be connected to the Spur 399 Preferred Alternative and that is how they were evaluated in the DEIS. The decision for the US 380 Preferred Alternative is not based on the Preferred Alternative for Spur 399.  According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
747	4/3/2023	Harry Baumgarten	Online	<p>As a McKinney resident, I find that TXDOT’s recommendation of Segment A over Segment B ignores the findings of the environmental study, applies criteria to support this decision inconsistently, is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers and places an unsupportable financial burden on the City of McKinney and its taxpayers.</p> <p>Findings of the Environmental Impact Study should have led to selection of Segment B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No businesses displaced, rather than 15 current businesses displaced in Segment A.</li> <li>• 2 rather than 7 major utility conflicts in Segment A</li> <li>• No hazardous material sites impacted, rather than 2 in Segment A.</li> <li>• Nearly twice the impact to rivers and streams; ½ mile vs. 1 mile</li> <li>• Segment A impacts more than 30 irreplaceable Heritage trees, aged over 150 years.</li> </ul> <p>Segment B saves over \$150 million dollars for Collin County Taxpayers vs. Segment A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$153M in right of way costs, rather than \$198M in Segment A.</li> <li>• \$25M in utility relocation costs, rather than \$75 in Segment A.</li> <li>• \$588M in design and construction costs rather than \$608M in Segment A.</li> <li>• \$40M savings in utility relocation for the City of McKinney.</li> </ul> <p>TXDOT’s own findings indicate that the continued emphasis on ManeGait is unwarranted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design updates to Segment B have fully mitigated any impact to ManeGait</li> <li>• TXDOT has received a copy of a study from Shea Center &amp; Dreamcatchers, California service ranch with a similar project that impacted their area which found there was minimal impact.</li> <li>• TXDOT has said that Segment B “would not make the ManeGait inaccessible to persons with disabilities and would not violate the Americans with Disabilities Act” Priority has not been given to safety and the increased risk of fatal accidents</li> <li>• Segment A contains two 90 degree turns with a change of grade which will present a greater risk of fatal accidents.</li> <li>• TXDOT did not reveal the comparison between fatality analysis for Segment A &amp; B</li> </ul> <p>Segment A involves reconstructing an additional 3.8 miles of existing 380 Highway increasing the risk of work zone accidents, and disrupting existing traffic patterns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to TXDOT, 26,000 work zone crashes in 2021 resulted in 244 deaths.</li> <li>• The extended construction time required to regrade the existing road bed will increase the disruption to existing traffic for several years of construction.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria used to support Segment selection was not applied consistently.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. TxDOT is also still evaluating the impacts of the Segment A shift which was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing. It did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>The criteria applied to recommend Segment C, would conclude Segment B is the preferred option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C vs. D was compared based on objective cost data</li> <li>• A vs. B comparison featured subjective measures, such as counting the number of comments submitted vs. objective facts</li> </ul> <p>The current TXDOT budget and plans do not include the mitigation measures necessary to address the impact of increased environmental and noise pollution, as well as concerning traffic hazards, for the current McKinney neighborhoods impacted by Segment A. In addition to the depressed roadway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sound wall across the full length of Tucker Hill property fronting 380 consistent with the character of the entry being removed and providing privacy from cut thru traffic.</li> <li>• The extension of Stonebridge Drive and new entrance on Townsend Boulevard for Tucker Hill residents in the character of the current entrance at Tremont Boulevard.</li> </ul>	<p>35 interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT provides a summary of fatal and injury crashes by alternative on page 2-33 of the DEIS.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>
748	2/16/2023	Heather McCauley	Paper form	<p>I strongly oppose Route C. Please go with Route D, which will not disrupt the wildlife, people, properties, and businesses that have been there for generations.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.
749	4/20/2023	Heather B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
750	3/7/2023	Heather Guarnera	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
751	3/15/2023	Heather M. Booth	Email	Hello! As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Heather M. Booth, MS, OTR	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
752	2/17/2023	Heather McCauley	Online	I strongly oppose Route C, it will destroy too much wildlife and ranches and property. Please please go with Route D, which goes through a floodplain and will not disrupt the wildlife, people, properties and their businesses that have been there for generations.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.
753	3/15/2023	Heather McGowan	Email	To: Stephen.Endres@txdot.gov As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely- Longtime homeowner, tax payer & citizen of Mckinney	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
754	4/20/2023	Heather P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
755	2/25/2023	Heather Peoples	Online	I want to voice my concern over this project and say NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Segment A has a detrimental impact on surrounding communities and will create major traffic disruptions, increased noise, increased health and environmental concerns, as well as impact our schools and neighborhoods.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
756	2/18/2023	Heather Powell	Online	Prosper has planned for the expansion of 380. Prosper should not have to pay for the mistakes of McKinney. We are a smaller city than McKinney and we have less land to utilize for the best interest of Prosper. We have areas that need to be protected for the best interest of the community as well. The Bypass would wreck the future plans of said land. Please keep the bypass East of Prosper.	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
757	4/20/2023	Heather T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A; yes to segment B. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Route B looks like a safer road system with less turns, accidents and traffic delays. Additionally B will have less of negative impact on the environment and climate change as the traffic will flow more efficiently.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
758	2/6/2023	Heidi Pastore-Carter	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
759	4/20/2023	Helen B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
760	4/20/2023	Helen W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote in favor of Option B.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
761	2/13/2023	Helene Langer	Email	<p>Please take this comment against the Blue Alternative for the 380 bypass development. I currently reside my two horses at Tara Royal Equestrian Center which is the most peaceful serene environment I have found in North Dallas. The blue option would put an 8 lane road at the front door of the facility which would make horse training impossible and destroy the location that is in place for our horses. I am in favor of the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>Helene Langer Equistar Consulting Group, LLC 949-836-0130</p>	Your comment, opposition of the Blue Alternative, and support of the Purple Alternative is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
762	3/15/2023	Hemanshu Narsana	Email	Hi Mr. Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Hemanshu Narsana	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
763	3/16/2023	Herbert Bennett	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
764	4/20/2023	Herbert H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Oppose the plan A and favor plan B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
765	2/25/2023	Holly and Dusty Tripp	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.  We live in Stonebridge Ranch, just south of 380, between Stonebridge Drive and Custer Road. The construction and ultimate freeway itself will be a major negative to our home. If we ever want to sell our home, this will decrease the value of our property. Our neighborhood has so many teenagers that have to travel this way to get to McKinney North High School, and I would not want my new driver having to navigate the construction or the highway itself. So many reasons. There would be so much less negative impact on both residents and businesses if the path would veer north BEFORE it gets to the Custer Road area of McKinney.  Our opposition to Segment A of the "Blue Alternative" is based on the following facts presented by TxDOT in their February 2023 Announcement: 1. Segment A destroys 27 businesses, 12 displacements and 2 homes currently. It will likely be more than that by the time the project is constructed whereas Segment B destroys no business, 7 displacements,	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.  Right-of-way acquisition estimates were calculated using Collin County Appraisal District as a guide to come up with square footage cost. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser.  TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>and 5 homes.</p> <p>2. The cost of Segment A right of way acquisition estimated today is \$957.8 million compared to \$888.8 million for Segment B. It is likely to reach more than \$1 billion by the time the project is constructed based on current construction projects which are not counted in the current TxDOT estimates.</p> <p>3. The proposed Blue Alternative which includes Segment A calls for \$120 million from the City of McKinney for right of way acquisition which will be an unplanned tax burden to McKinney taxpayers. The amount of that tax burden quite likely will increase as the cost of ROW acquisitions and related expenses increase.</p> <p>4. Segment A will have a significant detrimental impact on Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill which border the proposed construction of Segment A. It will create major traffic disruption, increased noise, and increased health and environmental problems, not to mention the impact on schools, morning and afternoon traffic, and school zones divided by US380 Segment A.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter and our position.                      Holly and Dusty Tripp                      1200 Stonington Drive                      McKinney TX 75071                      214-403-0031</p>	<p>acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:                      -building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,                      -depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and                      -providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</p>
766	4/20/2023	Holly M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a Realtor for 33 years and a lifelong resident of McKinney I am extremely familiar with the traffic on Hwy 380. The loop is highly necessary but the Coit road route is clearly the best route.	Your comment is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
767	4/20/2023	Holly Rudnick	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres, Attached please find my letter opposing Segment A. Note that I have been a Collin County resident for 25 years and a City of McKinney resident for 13 years. We purchased our home in Tucker Hill in 2010, and were told at that time that there were no plans for building out 380 into a major highway. We were told that any major highway would be located along the Outer Loop. We purchased our home under that premise and believed that to be true until recent years. We have raised our children in this neighborhood and had plans to retire here. However, we lived through the highway expansion of 121 and I have no desire to go through that again. I suffer from allergies and the dust and dirt from construction alone would be very detrimental to my health. I can barely hear 380 now from my home, but if this highway goes alongside both in the front and on the side of Tucker Hill, this will significantly impact my ability to sleep and enjoy our neighborhood. My quality of life and my husband's quality of life are at stake. It makes absolutely zero sense to adopt Segment A, from both a financial and impact perspective. This is a Collin County problem that deserves a Collin County solution. Why should City of McKinney residents bear the brunt of the burden here? Special interests and politicians are not the ones who will suffer! Please reconsider selecting Segment A and instead consider selecting Segment B. Thank-you, Holly Rudnick</p> <p><i>Attached comment and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p><i>Attached comment and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
768	4/20/2023	Holly T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to Segment A. That large of a road should veer north before it ever gets to Custer Road for the least impact to McKinney home and businesses.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
769	4/4/2023	Hong Yun	Online	<p>Please change to segment B instead of Segment A. I live in Auburn Hills subdivision and there will be noise issue. Please change to segment B instead of segment A. I believe segment B will also be cost effective.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
770	3/21/2023	Howard and Cathy Whiddon	Email	<p>Stephen, My wife and I would like you to vote No to Segment A. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Tx., My wife and I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDot has an existing option Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to over 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. We strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Rd. to FM1827. Sincerely, Howard and Cathy Whiddon 6021 Prestwick Dr McKinney, Tx 75072</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
771	3/15/2023	Hugh and Khedra Haywood	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, The Haywood Family</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
772	3/16/2023	Hugh Haywood	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
773	3/7/2023	Hugh Ollech	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
774	3/7/2023	Humberto Garza	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
775	2/6/2023	Iglesia Cristo La Unica Esperanza	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
776	3/15/2023	Ishvinder Malhotra	Email	<p>Hi Stephen,  As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,  Thanks &amp; Regards  Ishvinder Malhotra,  US: M: +1 469-996-8118  IND: M: +91 9899882666</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
777	2/10/2023	Ivan Clemons	Online	<p>I am infuriated by this proposal. TxDot is proposing to put a bypass in my backyard. However I have seen very little of your proposal to help impact residents. I built my home in 2015 when the same plans showed a two lane road was going to be built on CR123. We specifically chose a smaller lot to be further away from the two lane road and now there's a proposal to build a bypass. I find it unlawful to share proposed infrastructure plans and allow people to make decisions from those plans to change it later. I will not allow this to happen. I will pursue all means available to stop this and hold people accountable. This is absurd and the city of Mckinney should not allow for neighborhoods to be built and then drop in a bypass. What are you going to do for the residents!!!! I strongly oppose all plans for this bypass. I can barely drive without running over roadkill from all the destruction to their habitat. Now you are coming for mines!</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition to the project is noted.</p>
778	4/20/2023	Ivan H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Definitely do not want Segment A.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
779	4/5/2023	J Claunch	Online	<p>I vote Yes to segment B as it meets the goals better. It results in far fewer displacements of existing homes and businesses vs the other option where "future" properties are concerned. Future Prosper businesses have time to adapt. SEgment B is the lower cost option. And it better meets the whole purpose of the bypass project because it bypasses more; particular the US380 Custer Rd intersection. Finally Seg B is a gentle curve, which will mean less traffic stops and resulting pollution than the hard left/hard right of A.</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and local streets. The proposed frontage road at city street intersections will provide opportunities for left turns or U-turns at signalized intersections, thereby reducing the number of "stops" and conflict points.</p>
780	2/6/2023	J David/ Karen Thompson	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
781	2/22/2023	J H	Online	Build it! Get dirt moving and concrete poured. This road was needed years ago. People will complain about any choice made. Less disruptive than other alignments. Build it!	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
782	4/20/2023	J T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Strongly oppose Segment A!! This option is more costly & makes absolutely NO sense.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
783	3/28/2023	J. Artwick	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, J. Artwick 7704 Powder Horn Lane McKinney, TX 75070	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
784	2/17/2023	J. Bradley Johnston	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing to support the TXDOT decision to route the proposed US 380 bypass along the Blue Route (Segments A-E-C) as presented at your public meeting held on Thursday, February 16, 2023. In particular, with regard to the choice of Segment A versus Segment B, I agree with TXDOT's findings that Segment A would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displace fewer homes in comparison to Segment B;</li> <li>• Result in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes;</li> <li>• Avoid displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road;</li> <li>• Utilize more of the existing US 380 alignment; and</li> <li>• Avoid impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, a very important and highly-valued provider of services to Veterans and those with disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for the time and effort you and TXDOT have expended in coming to this conclusion. Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Bradley Johnston  220 Columbia Court  Prosper, TX 75078  512/657-7794</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
785	3/8/2023	J. V. Closs	Email	<p>Good morning Mr. Endres,</p> <p>As a graduate of Carnegie-Mellon University, I know a little bit about engineering. I can understand why you are building Segment C and not Segment D. You are by-passing more of the existing US380 with that choice. So, why are you building Segment A and not Segment B? The proposed choice costs more while by-passing less of the existing US 380. As choosing Segment A over Segment B is not the logical choice, it must be the political choice. I support logic and the taxpayers who will be footing the bill.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>J. V. Closs  Class of '75</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
786	2/21/2023	J.B.	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
787	3/15/2023	J.S. De Mattei	Email	<p>I would like to express my support for the "Blue Alignment" as shown on the latest DEIS, at it adequately addresses: the environmental, social, and engineering requirements of the project. Sincerely,                      J.S. De Mattei                      300 Yosemite Drive                      Prosper, TX 75078-9071</p>	<p>Your comment and support of the Blue Alternative is noted.</p>
788	2/25/2023	Jack DeLano	Email	<p>Hello,                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				Thanks, Jack DeLano	
789	4/20/2023	Jack H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes, to segment B. Most "common sense" option!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
790	2/17/2023	Jack Moore	Online	Segment C would be an utter catastrophe and frankly not only would potentially displace hundreds of Texans, but will also displace and adversely affect wildlife. From not only the variations of animals/livestock on private property, but also the many fish, roadrunners, coyotes, birds, snakes and rodents that call the area home. The metroplex has been bustling and is starting to become so dense and congested, that adding another highway and displacing residents that have contributed to the conservation of the land would be an utter failure and would frankly go against every value that the state of Texas has used to identify itself since its inception. Segment D, not only affects less homes/businesses, but also has the least amount of impact on wildlife and allows more families to remain whole and spread the joy of sharing their land/life with others for generations to come. Blood, sweat and tears have gone into each parcel of land, dont let money, greed and bullish ways destroy it.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a> . It outlines that for an EIS project, TxDOT is supposed to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things that TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.
791	4/20/2023	Jack N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Route B least disruptive to community	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
792	3/31/2023	Jack Noteware	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Jack Noteware	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
793	4/20/2023	Jack S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	TxDot – your own data supports B. Please reconsider..	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
794	3/24/2023	Jack Sumrall	Email	TxDOT Stephen Endres Dear Mr. Endres: Going all the way back to 2017 when TxDOT decided that a by-pass was the only feasible answer for the 380 dilemma – you said that McKinney was too developed and built-up along the existing 380 right-a-way. The Green Alternative was scrapped. A by-pass was the best solution and it was obvious that the Blue Alternative was far and away the better choice. However, inexplicably, TxDOT recommended the Red Alternative. We were completely shocked. “WHY”, we asked, “even have a by-pass if so much of west McKinney would be adversely affected? Are we not developed? Do we not count?” The only explanation the TxDOT spokesperson could meekly offer was that the Blue route would uproot the MainGait Therapeutic Horse Ranch. It was obvious then (and is still true), that regardless how many factors favored the Blue Alternative, MainGait trumped everything. Even when the City of McKinney offered a generous bid to purchase MainGait and allow them to stay as long as needed, TxDOT said it didn’t matter to them because MainGait didn’t respond to the offer. If TxDOT has not been swamped with responses supporting Segment B. The reason is simple. Segment B supporters feel completely beaten down and ignored by the bias TxDOT has shown for Segment A. Many west-siders have given up trying to provide reasonable arguments for Segment B when they feel that it doesn’t matter to TxDOT. We feel that TxDOT has been influenced too strongly by the Darlings, the City of Prosper and other unknown forces to be objective. Political pressures have prevented TxDOT from making a fair, fact-based decision. You (TxDOT) really fooled us last year by changing the Blue Alternative into the Red Option B. We foolishly thought that you had listened, read your own data and found a route that didn’t go through MainGait. Red B took the by-pass a little further west and gave those of us living and working in west McKinney along 380, great relief. Red B had many advantages over Red A as documented in TxDOT’s own, very thorough, Segment Analysis:	Your comment and support of the project is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over \$100M less</li> <li>- Homes/Apartments effected</li> <li>- Hazardous sites</li> <li>- Utility/Water conflicts ...</li> <li>- and, several others</li> </ul> <p>Most importantly, Red B went around MainGait. We actually thought that a fair analysis had finally been done, and it would protect the sacred ground at MainGait. It was a great feeling, but it turns out that you 'rope-a-doped' us into complacency. Apparently MainGait said it was still too close; or Prosper warned "not in our city limits" – who knows? ... but the bottom line is that TxDOT ignored their own data in choosing Option A. It makes no sense. At this point I believe that TxDOT has known from Day One what it was going to do on the west juncture of the bypass. Everything since has been cleverly finding ways to support what you were going to do regardless of what the analysis showed. The Red B option wasn't really in the running. I read the DEIS study, and I think the key statement was in the beginning summary where it was stated "TxDOT has selected the Blue Alternative (A+E+C) as the Preferred Alternative." The rest of it could be used to support any of the alternatives. TxDOT reminds me of the story about the big company that was looking for a new accountant and presented the candidates with a complex accounting scenario. Then hired the accountant that responded, "What do you want the answer to be?" I almost didn't write this because, like a lot of my neighbors, I don't think it matters to TxDOT. However, I'm mostly optimistic and I believe in miracles.</p> <p>Jack Sumrall 7404 Province St. McKinney 75071 (214) 937-1501 [REDACTED]</p> <p>"Honest scales and balances are from the Lord; All the weights in the bag are His making" Proverbs 16:11</p>	
795	3/27/2023	Jack Sumrall	Comment Form	<p>I also e-mailed a copy to Mr. Endres</p> <p>Going all the way back to 2017 when TxDOT decided that a by-pass was the only feasible answer for the 380 dilemma -- you said that McKinney was too developed and built-up along the existing 380 right-a-way. The Green Alternative was scrapped. A by-pass was the best solution and it was obvious that the Blue Alternative was far and away the better choice. However, inexplicably, TxDot recommended the Red Alternative. We were completely shocked. "WHY", we asked, "even have a by-pass if so much of west McKinney would be adversely affected? Are we not developed? Do we not count?" The only explanation the TxDOT spokesperson could meekly offer was that the Blue route would uproot the MainGait Therapeutic Horse Ranch. It was obvious then (and is still true), that regardless how many factors favored the Blue Alternative, MainGait trumped everything. Even when the City of McKinney offered a generous bid to purchase MainGait and allow them to stay as long as needed, TxDOT said it didn't matter to</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>them because MainGait didn't respond to the offer. If TxDOT has not been swamped with responses supporting Segment B. The reason is simple. Segment B supporters feel completely beaten down and ignored by the bias TxDOT has shown for Segment A. Many west-siders have given up trying to provide reasonable arguments for Segment B when they feel that it doesn't matter to TxDOT. We feel that TxDOT has been influenced too strongly by the Darlings, the City of Prosper and other unknown forces to be objective. Political pressures have prevented TxDOT from making a fair, fact-based decision. You (TxDOT) really fooled us last year by changing the Blue Alternative into the Red Option B. We foolishly thought that you had listened, read your own data and found a route that didn't go through MainGait. Red B took the by-pass a little further west and gave those of us living and working in west McKinney along 380, great relief. Red B had many advantages over Red A as documented in TxDOT's own, very thorough, Segment Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over \$100M less</li> <li>- Homes/Apartments effected</li> <li>- Hazardous sites</li> <li>- Utility/Water conflicts ...</li> <li>- and, several others</li> </ul> <p>Most importantly. Red B went around MainGait. We actually thought that a fair analysis had finally been done, and it would protect the sacred ground at MainGait. It was a great feeling, but, it turns out that you 'rope-a-doped' us into complacency. Apparently MainGait said it was still too close; or Prosper warned "not in our city limits" -- who knows? ... but, the bottom line is that TxDOT ignored their own data in choosing Option A. It makes no sense. At this point I believe that TxDOT has known from Day One what it was going to do on the west juncture of the bypass. Everything since has been cleverly finding ways to support what you were going to do regardless of what the analysis showed. The Red B option wasn't really in the running. I read the DEIS study, and I think the key statement was in the beginning summary where it was stated " TxDOT has selected the Blue Alternative (A+E+C) as the Preferred Alternative." The rest of it could be used to support any of the alternatives. TxDOT reminds me of the story about the big company that was looking for a new accountant and presented the candidates with a complex accounting scenario. Then hired the accountant that responded, "What do you want the answer to be?" I almost didn't write this because, like a lot of my neighbors, I don't think it matters to TxDOT. However, I'm mostly optimistic and I believe in miracles.</p> <p>Jack Sumrall  7404 Province St.  McKinney 75071  (214) 937-1501  ██████████</p> <p>"Honest scales and balances are from the Lord; All the weights in the bag are His making" Proverbs 16:11</p>	

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
796	4/20/2023	Jack W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO SEGMENT A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
797	2/24/2023 3/9/2023	Jack Warren III	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks, Jack Warren III	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
798	4/20/2023	Jackie F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please say no to segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
799	2/20/2023	Jackson Hurst	Online	I approve and support TxDOT's US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 in Collin County Project. I have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for TxDOT's US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 in Collin County Project and I support the findings in the DEIS Document. I also approve and support the preferred build alternative for TxDOT's US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 in Collin County Project because the build alternative will result in fewer impacts to future homes.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
800	3/15/2023	Jaclyn Paz	Email	Hello, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jaclyn Paz	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
801	3/10/2023	Jacob Seyb	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
802	4/20/2023	Jacqueline M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Option A Yes to Option B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
803	4/20/2023	James B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B please.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
804	2/21/2023	James Brunk	Email	Mr. Endres, I have 2 comments on the proposed bypass. 1. There is no need for an 8 lane superhighway, 6 would do. And there is no reason to add access roads. It is a short bypass, not a part of the Interstate system. Just make exits at the main roads. Save money! Less property required. 2. The western end of the route should extend closer to Coit, not terminate at Stonebridge ranch drive. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. James Brunk	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.
805	4/20/2023	James D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is the obvious choice since it cost less, is less of a tax burden, destroys fewer business and homes!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
806	4/20/2023	James D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Proportion B	Your comment is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
807	2/26/2023	James Glenn	Email	As a 16-year plus resident of the Stonebridge community, I have endured the traffic volume increase along highway 380 from a 2-lane congested road to a 4-lane even more congested one. The proposed bypasses are laudable but in the bigger scheme of things, I believe Option A will probably be a significant waste of taxpayer monies with very little achieving the desired objective. As I'm sure you realize, traffic today from Stonebridge through the Custer/380 interchange is as congested as any other stretch of the proposed bypass. In my opinion it would appear the current Option A plans are more designed to placate the very vocal voices of the community north of 380. I have a friend who lives in a subdivision on Custer to the north of 380 who told me why should his community be impacted by something created by McKinney's poor planning. I respect his opinion but I believe the 380 issue has been significantly affected by the explosive growth to the north of Collin County. I know there is no easy solution but I don't think the planned waste of financial resources will solve the problem. I suggest TXDOT is faced with the proverbial Gordian Knot issue. At my age I probably will not be around to observe the final resolution so therefore this is just my opinion for what it's worth. Respectfully, James Glenn Sent from my iPad	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. Your statement about explosive Collin County growth is accurate. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.  Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.
808	2/22/2023	James Hopkins	Online	I'm vehemently opposed to section C of the 380 bypass. I live in the SW section of the Willow Woods estate on the last street. If section C is approved it will e right in my back yard. I moved to this area to get away from the nose and hassle of traffic, not to have built in my back yard. I don't want the sounds of nature replaced with the noise of construction and traffic. NO TO SECTION C NO TO SECTION C	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
809	3/16/2023	James Hopkins	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
810	2/25/2023	James Jenkins	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, James Jenkins, CPCU, CIC, CRM Founder & CEO RiskWell "Life Is Risky. RiskWell." P: 469-678-8001 W: www.riskwell.com	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
811	3/14/2023	James Jensen	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, James Jensen	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
812	2/24/2023 2/25/2023	James Jones	Email (1) Online (1)	I am a resident of Stonebridge Ranch I support Plan B. Thank You James Jones	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
813	4/20/2023	James L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B will cause significantly more disruption than Segment A.	Your comment is noted.
814	3/13/2023	James Levins	Email	I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. James	This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.  Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
815	3/15/2023	James Martin	Online	The Blue option is the most logical choice (A,E,C). Thank you for taking the time to consider and reduce the impact to Maingate and Prosper as a whole. We looked at homes in Mckinney's Tucker hill back in 2013 but decided we didn't want to live on a main highway. Those residence made a choice to be next to a major highway. We made a choice to be away from the highway. We pay a penalty by having to drive further and through more traffic but it's the choice we made and we stand by it. I still feel strongly that this entire activity is to give Mckinney better access to land they want to develop and will do very little to curb traffic through McKinney. People won't go north to go south. (Denton, Tyler, FortWorth) all have examples where this type of project didn't help with traffic in the desired areas.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
816	2/28/2023	James Nichols	Online	We are wanting to voice our full support for keeping 380 on 380 through prosper which would mean using route A. Prosper was planned and designed with room for 380 expansion. Please keep 380 on 380 in Prosper. Thank you. James and Karen Nichols	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
817	4/20/2023	James O	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, James Olsen	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
818	4/20/2023	James P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to Segment B; No to Segment A!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
819	4/20/2023	James P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Noboyd ever mentions the impact to Timberridge. It doesn't even show on the maps as being a \"point of interest\" and this highway will run	Your comment is noted. The Timberridge neighborhood is named on Figure 4-5 in Appendix K of the DEIS and our interactive map (link provided on the Public Hearing webpage <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> ). TxDOT would not have to acquire any right-of-way from the neighborhood as it is generally over 1,000 feet from the project's proposed right-of-way to the closest Timberridge property line.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
820	3/16/2023	James Radcliff	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
821	3/16/2023	James Redwine	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
822	3/7/2023	James Rushing	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. James Rushing 2705 TRAVIS DR MCKINNEY, TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
823	4/20/2023	James Scott H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
824	4/20/2023	James T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Not Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
825	4/20/2023	James W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
826	2/6/2023	James W Bodiford	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
827	4/20/2023	James Y	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>If the city of McKinney supports option A, every city leader who supports that option, should lose their position next election. Why would the city want TXDOT to spend more money, increase the tax burden, disrupt more homes and businesses and ignore the 36,000 residences (voters) Stonebridge Ranch, one of the premier communities in McKinney. It's unthinkable. It's time take some action No to option A, YES to option B.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
828	4/20/2023	Jami B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B. The delay in addressing the traffic and issues of 380 has already caused enough problems. Don't make it worse by bringing even more traffic to our neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
829	2/17/2023	Jami Woodward	Online	<p>I am writing to strongly urge you to choose Segment D (NOT Segment C). Segment C will truly be catastrophic to our community, families, businesses, and to our natural habitats and woodlands. Segment C displaces far more families than D. It will destroy the property of 29 residences, more than four times the number of affected properties with Segment D. Some of these residences along Segment C serve the community with church meetings. The ripple effect will be felt far and wide. In addition, over three times the number of businesses will be affected with Segment C than D. Furthermore, Segment C damages one of the largest remaining forests in this part of Collin County. This is so devastating that Texas Parks and Wildlife prefers Segment D. And finally, Segment C has worse traffic performance, including lower traffic capacity, longer travel times, slower traffic speeds, and more elevation changes. In conclusion, all the signs point to Segment D being the only and most logical choice.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the U. and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
830	3/13/2023	Jamile A. Ashmore	Email	<p>Dear Stephen and others, I am formally requesting the following. Also, please add the additional comments to the public record.</p> <p>1) An extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect the individual residents, communities, and businesses affected by Option A.</p> <p>2) A meeting with TxDOT and the consulting acoustician, Robert Brenneman. There has not been enough time allowed to read the 500+ page noise document. It is unlikely that stakeholders (residents, city leaders) can understand the technical study, which is essential to making informed decisions. Below are some growing concerns based on consult with acousticians and noise pollution experts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have taken our own acoustic measurements in Tucker Hill, and they do not align with what is being reported in the noise data document. It also does not appear that the additive effect of the North-South portion of the current preferred alignment was considered.</li> <li>• Therefore, we need more information on the estimates and methodology used to measure current and predicted future noise. I live deep within Tucker Hill and can currently hear 380 traffic in my bedroom with windows and plantation shutters closed.</li> <li>• It appears TxDOT is taking the noise levels all the way up to the legal limit</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment is noted. This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>of 67db and beyond in some cases, which is extraordinarily high for any community. This is especially relevant to Tucker Hill, which was designed to be an outdoor community with a front porch on every home. These issues do not appear to be addressed in the 500+ pages of noise data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tucker Hill should be classified in the “A” activity category on the Noise Abatement Criteria.</li> <li>• There is an established and growing scientific literature indicating that noise pollution generated at levels as low as 55db is associated with physical, psychological, and behavioral problems (e.g., heart disease, anxiety, sleep disturbance, and dementia). Individuals at retirement age and children may be the most susceptible, and they reside 24/7 in areas that will be most affected by the current preferred alignment. Of note, Tucker Hill has many vulnerable special needs adults and children including one that lives in our household.</li> <li>• It is imperative that TxDOT, other government entities, and government representatives move away from outdated precedence and use current methods and knowledge to make decisions. At this time it appears that the preferred alignment may put citizens at risk for mental health problems and physical disease despite that another safer, less expensive, and logical alignment option is available. Pollutants (noise and particulate) and physical and psychological pathology can be measured objectively.</li> <li>• As presented by TxDOT, the owners of ManeGait claim that they have built a "new sensory trail" through their own private property. Per TxDOT record, their personal property appears to be the only Manegait related property that would be disrupted by the East of Custer alignment. Manegait operations and services would not be effected with the East of Custer alignment per record.</li> <li>• We established years ago that ManeGait does not provide necessary services to protected populations. ManeGait’s past unscrupulous efforts to mitigate the East of Custer alignment is documented and confirmed (e.g., falsifying public comment sent to TxDOT).</li> <li>• The ManeGait facility, horses, and parks can be moved. Indeed, a proposed land swap in the City of McKinney was under consideration, and ManeGait refused. In collaboration with citizens it is the responsibility of government related entities and city leaders to work together to make decisions that protect the fiscal, physical, and emotional well-being of the residents they represent.</li> </ul> <p>At this time it does not appear all relevant information has been considered in the 380 by-pass decision making process. Please grant an extension for comments and set a meeting that will help us all better understand the pollutant issues as well as other ongoing issues. Sincerely,                      Jamile A. Ashmore, Ph.D.                      Board Certified in Clinical Health Psychology                      214-477-9275                      [REDACTED]</p>	<p>TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
831	4/19/2023	Jamile A. Ashnore	Email	<p>Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) c/o Stephen Endres: Re: Comments for DEIS Highway 380 Bypass alignment A vs B I adamantly oppose TxDOT's current preferred alignment (Segment A) because: 1) it is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more than the alternative B, 2) TxDOT applied criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and 3) TxDOT provided numerous omissions, biases, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
832	3/10/2023	Jan Chapman	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
833	3/29/2023	Jan Clare	Email	Mr. Endres, I am writing in support of Segment A. I appreciate your professionalism during this long process. You do not have an easy job! As a resident of Walnut Grove, I am also asking you to consider implementing the Alternative Plan for the 380/Custer intersection. It seems safer and much less complicated. Sincerely, Jan Clare Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad	Your comment and support of the project and the Alternative Design for the US 380 and Custer Road intersection is noted.
834	3/7/2023	Jan Forth	Email	Stephen Endres TxDot NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSED the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDot has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens, throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jan Forth	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
835	4/20/2023	Jan H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
836	2/25/2023	Jana Horowitz	Online	Our family fully supports segment A as the preferred alignment. Thank you for the current EIS recommendation to keep 380 on 380 through Prosper.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
837	4/20/2023	Jane A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	You must choose the drastically less expensive Segment B to prove that Texas is home to fiscally responsible and sensible people. How the less practical, and far more expensive Segment A was endorsed by TxDOT is just incomprehensible to me.	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.</p> <p>The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p>
838	3/7/2023	Jane Schrick	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
839	3/16/2023	Janeim Calderon Lopez	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
840	3/30/2023	Janelle Freeman	Written Comment Form	Hello TXDOT --- Pon US380 Bypass --- No on Segment A I strongly oppose Segment A because of the additional cost and the impact to existing homes and business, as well as the traffic flow at major mckinney intersections and the impact to existing neighborhoods Please implement Segment B on US380 bypass. Janelle Freeman 3413 Sliding Rock DR McKinney TX 75070	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts.
841	4/20/2023	Janelle F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A - it doesn't make financial or traffic flow sense. Yes to Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
842	3/16/2023	Janet Ferrari	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
843	4/20/2023	Janet G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Protecting our property values, and quality of residential living is paramount to citizens and neighborhoods directly affected by other options offered to us.	Your comment is noted. Changes in property values are driven by value associated with site specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee which of these impacts will impact the value of the subject property in a negative or positive way.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
844	3/16/2023	Janet Herndon	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Janet Herndon	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
845		Janet L Beavan	Comment Form	I oppose segment "C" catastrophe!! as it will effect many residences + effect wildlife + rural land. Destroys forest + woodlands and will displace wildlife in this area, this is not a good option!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
846	4/20/2023	Janet M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
847	1/20/2023	Janet M. Gagnon	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, I have reviewed the posted DEIA for 380 Bypass and its attachments. However, I do not see the written comments that I submitted to you via your website contained in Attachment F. Where exactly are my written comments reflected in this document? Did you lose the written comments submitted by residents that used the online website for submission? It is very alarming to me that this document has been published publicly and is incomplete and inaccurate. Sincerely, Janet M. Gagnon 1991 Sunset Trail McKinney, TX 75071	Email response from TxDOT on 1/23/2023:  The comments from the public meeting are included in the public meeting summary which is located at following links. <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-environmental-impact-statement-from-coit-road-to-fm-1827">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-environmental-impact-statement-from-coit-road-to-fm-1827</a>  TxDOT follow-up:  Please visit the following link: <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPROVED%200135-02-065etc%20US380_PublicMeetingDocumentation_1%20of%204_08.16.2022.pdf">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPROVED%200135-02-065etc%20US380_PublicMeetingDocumentation_1%20of%204_08.16.2022.pdf</a> . Your comment is on page 1,515 of the document.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
848	3/19/2023	Janet Magana	Online	As residents of the Tucker Hill Community in McKinney we are 100% AGAINST the preference of Segment A for the 380 Bypass Project. Your plan to build this highway right next to our community is DISGRACEFUL. You will completely disrupt our lives and ruin the peace and tranquility of the ONE AND ONLY PORCH community in McKinney. Your project will RUIN the air quality in our neighborhood both during construction and decades after with the close proximity of traffic. And, you have yet to confirm adding a sufficient sound barrier to reduce noise levels. As it is we can hear noise from the vehicles traveling on 380 - 24 hours a day. We cant imagine how much worse it will be with a large highway practically on top of us. You have OTHER choices - DO THE RIGHT THING bbefore you move ahead ruining our neighborhood! John and Janet Magana 7501 Townsend Blvvd., Tucker Hill, McKinney	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.  Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.
849	4/20/2023	Janie M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A is too expensive, imposes on more homes, businesses.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
850	3/16/2023	Janine Lyans	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
851	4/20/2023	Jaqueline W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A!!!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
852	4/20/2023	Jasmijn M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Research shows Option B is much less disruptive than Option A. Please reconsider or provide alternatives versus displacing residents and businesses all the while spending more money.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
853	3/16/2023	Jasmine M.	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
854	3/7/2023	Jason McClintock	Email	Stephen, I'm a resident of Stonebridge and I strongly oppose the construction of segment A. The correct decision would be to use Segment B, which is cheaper and will lessen the tax burden for McKinney residents. Segment B would also destroy less businesses and homes! I STRONGLY urge you to implement Segment B. Thank You, Jason McClintock	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
855	3/7/2023	Jason Reed	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
856	4/3/2023	Jason Reiss	Email	<p>Senator Paxton, Representative Leach, and Mr. Endres: I strongly oppose Segment C and I support Segment D. There are fewer homes and businesses affected. I am also worried about the damage and destruction to the largest remaining forest in central Collin County.</p> <p>Regards, Jason Reiss McKinney TX</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>
857	3/14/2023	Jason Thurow	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Jason Thurow</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
858	2/17/2023	Jason Woodward	Online	<p>As a McKinney resident, I am very concerned about the preferred project segment C for the US 380 EIS Project. I strongly oppose segment C and kindly ask TXDOT to pursue segment D instead of C. Segment C will have a much greater negative impact on our community. It will affect and displace more homes businesses and community resources than segment D. In addition, segment C damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County, destroying 71% more acres of forest and woodlands than segment D. I understand segment C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Finally, segment C will have worse traffic performance with lower traffic capacity, longer travel times, slower speeds, and more elevation changes. It seems the only benefit to segment C is the cost. I firmly believe the costs does not justify the other negative impacts to the community.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
859	4/20/2023	Jay A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I oppose Segment A. The alternative B is less expensive and destroys fewer businesses and homes. OF MAJOR CONCERN is the current noise pollution study and existing scientific data showing an association between traffic noise and physical and mental health problems. As currently planned, it appears that TxDOT and other segment B supporting officials may be knowingly supporting an alignment (A) that will likely cause health problems among residents when another viable and less expensive option is available. Homes cannot be moved. Horse farms can.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
860	4/4/2023	Jay Zonouzy and Family	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Enders,</p> <p>As a long time residence of Stonebridge Ranch community, I strongly oppose the proposed segment A, of 380 by pass. Segment A , is a much more costly, longer construction, and more intrusive proposal. will destroy more homes and business and disrupts the lives of over 36000 SBR residents. As one of the earliest and established communities with large number of residents in this part of McKinney, the damage/ loss of business/ loss of homes will be much more severe than the communities affected by your alternate segment B. The decision should be based on logic and cost and not by pressure by smaller but more affluent communities in segment B. Even looking at the plan, the proposed segment A, with a 90 degree sudden sweep north, does not look well engineered compared with segment B, with a gradual sweep that goes through less populated areas before joining the the north leg of the bypass. This should be decision based on logic, design, cost and less impact on residents. Considering all of this, the only logical and practical choice should be Segment B. Thank you,</p> <p>Jay Zonouzy and Family 22 year resident of Stonebridge Ranch</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
861	2/17/2023	Jayme Meyer	Email	<p>Hi Stephen,</p> <p>I am a resident of McKinney and writing to tell you that I oppose the route C option of the 380 Bypass. I really oppose all options, I am sick of the massive growth in Mckinney and taking away of the beauty this place was. If any have to be done, I prefer the option that disrupts the least amount of homes.</p> <p>Thank you Jayme Meyer AmerisourceBergen Corporation Finance Manager, SPS FP&amp;A</p>	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.
862	3/15/2023	JC Diaz	Online	agree with the proposed plan— keep 380 on 380 in Prosper, Texas	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
863	4/13/2023	JD	Email	<p>Good afternoon, Ms. Clemens and Mayor Fuller, Can you please review the attached report discussing the US 380 Coit Rd to FM 1827 Draft EIS? Ms. Clemens, can TxDOT please respond to each issue identified within? Thank you, JD</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
864	4/20/2023	JD	Email	<p>Good afternoon, Mr. Endres: As discussed during our meeting, I have attached the PDF copies of the two document submissions I provided to you. Please replace the paper copies that were submitted with the attached PDF copies. The attached copies include typo corrections and updates to the data based on the public hearing materials that were released after our meeting. Thank you, JD</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
865	3/14/2023	JD Eubank	Email	<p>Good afternoon, Ms. Clemens,</p> <p>I would like to schedule a meeting with you to discuss the DEIS for the US 380 Coit Rd to FM 1827 project. I have information I would like to share with you about Segments C and D in NE McKinney and have a couple questions regarding TxDOT's preference of Segment C and any possible adjustments.</p> <p>Please let me know a day and time that would work for you to meet with me.</p>	Comment noted. TxDOT is working to coordinate a meeting date and time.
866	3/17/2023	JD Eubank	Email	<p>Good afternoon, Ms. Clemens,</p> <p>We will be sure to submit the information and questions via the public feedback options. I will reach out again after the comment period closes to schedule a meeting to discuss them.</p> <p>During comment periods for previous meetings, some of the comments submitted were included in the Comments Received document but were not responded to and were omitted from the Comment Response Matrix. We want to make sure the comments are not overlooked this time.</p> <p>Thank you, JD</p>	<p>Comment noted. TxDOT is working to coordinate a meeting date and time.</p> <p>Please advise what comments were omitted from the matrix. A Public Meeting summary is available at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-environmental-impact-statement-from-coit-road-to-fm-1827">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-environmental-impact-statement-from-coit-road-to-fm-1827</a></p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
867	3/30/2023	Jean Allenson	Written Comment Form	To: TXDot Re: No to Segment A Why destroy McKinney businesses near Custer Road & 380!? That is a very flippant decision made by someone who "changed his mind." Really? Ridiculous! Spend Texas taxpayers money wisely! No to Segment A. Yes to Seg. B. Jean Allenson 1613 Hackett Creek Dr. McKinney TX 75072 972-740-0655	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts.
868	3/16/2023	Jean De Villers	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
869	3/10/2023	Jean Donley	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
870	3/7/2023	Jean Possehl	Email	Stephen, I am a resident of Stonebridge Ranch and because of that reason, I support segment B. I strongly oppose Segment A. Thank you, Jean Possehl Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
871	4/20/2023	Jean W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please choose segment B. Segment A goes by two elementary schools about 200 yards from 380 on Stonebridge and Ridge. They have together about 1000 hound children that would be affected by this project. The kids and their families are constantly outside and would be affected by the air pollution and noise 24 hours a day. Many families have backyards on both sides of 380 very near segment A( close to 30 yards away. When there's another option that doesn't effect so many lives, please choose segment B. Thank you for really listening 🍷	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
872	3/15/2023	Jeanette Lackey	Email	Good morning, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Respectfully, Jeanette Lackey	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
873	4/20/2023	Jeanette M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The worst traffic on 380 is at school hours, which the expansion will not impact. I've personally driven down 380 at 5:30/6:00 without delay. The expansion using Segment A is too short to do any good, much like the now-to-be destroyed I-980 segment in Oakland, CA!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
874	4/4/2023	Jeanette Pine	Email	<p>I am a resident of Collin County and am writing regarding the proposed bypass of Highway 380 in the northern part of the county. My understanding was that the A-E-D alignment was recommended following the feasibility study. However, at the last meeting regarding this matter A-E-C alignment was proposed as the preferred alternative. I would like to express my opposition to this proposal. Earlier in the process when other segments were studied, emphasis was given on impacting fewer homes, utilizing more of the existing US 380, and public concern. If this same criteria was applied to the segment in question, segment D would be the appropriate choice. Segment C disrupts and destroys communities along County Road 338 and FM 2933. We have friends whose property would be disrupted by the proposed highway and their small business destroyed. Several of their neighbors would completely lose their property. At stake also is the peaceful country life which led them to this location many years ago and the loss of neighbors who are friends. If the alternative Segment D were chosen, only one community along Woodlawn Road would be affected. The number of homes is significantly fewer and Segment D does not put neighbors on opposite sides of the freeway. I request that the initial A-E-D alignment recommended in the feasibility study be implemented. Thank you. Jeanette Pine</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT's Feasibility Study Recommended Alignment, which included a conceptual Segment D section, was based on the data collected during the Feasibility Study. Throughout the subsequent NEPA process, TxDOT has gathered more detailed information and continued work with stakeholders.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p>
875	4/20/2023	Jeannette M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Stop the "bait and switch". We already agreed on the preferred route and now it is switched with no reason given.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
876	3/26/2023	Jeannette Maher	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Jeannette Maher Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
877	3/9/2023	Jeannie Holm	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you! Jeannie Holm REALTOR®, Fathom Realty 214-733-1887 I'm always happy and available to answer any and all of your real estate questions. And, I'd be honored to be chosen to help you achieve your real estate goals!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
878	2/17/2023	Jeff Bodin	Online	My family and I live in Kensington Ranch which is directly off 380/University Drive. I'm opposed to Inset C: Alternative Design Segment A where the access road (in purple) from the new 380 runs directly in front of my street to connect to the old 380/University Drive. I believe this will lead to more traffic off of Freedom Drive than the proposed A segment.	Your comment and opposition to the alternative design for Segment A at the connection between existing and future US 380 is noted.  TxDOT analyses found the Blue Alternative is expected to attract traffic from arterial streets and from the existing US 380 (University Drive). Drivers taking long trips would likely take the freeway option because the mainlanes have no stop signs, they could drive at a higher rate of speed, and greatly reduce their travel times.
879	2/25/2023	Jeff Cotten	Email	Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you in advance for your attention to this. Jeff Cotten 214-392-0510	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
880	3/10/2023	Jeff Gustafson	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Jeff Gustafson 214.491.0096	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
881	3/15/2023	Jeff Kennedy	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,                      My position and comments remain the same as they did in April 2022 I am writing this response in stringent opposition to alignment B, an alignment that was not even on the table until McKinney Mayor George Fuller and U.S. House of Representative candidate Keith Self unethically used their political power to force an alignment on another town. A town, in Prosper, who have been good stewards by developing with an appropriate setback from 380 knowing that it would be widened at some point in the future. Not only does alignment B represent the ability of politicians to exert undue influence on other government agencies with a Goliath vs. David mindset, it is an alignment that would come within hundreds of feet of 3 schools and 45 feet of a therapeutic horse center that serves two vulnerable populations (children and veterans). Not to mention the already developed, or about to be developed, residential neighborhoods that would be eliminated and greatly reduce the tax dollars going to PISD. I urge TXDOT to stick with what was their preliminary (and now secondary) decision to widen 380 through Prosper and connect with the proposed alignment A.                      Regards,                      Jeff Kennedy                      4320 Fisher Rd. Prosper, TX 75078                      I am NOT employed by TXDOT                      I do NOT do business with TXDOT                      I would NOT benefit monetarily from the project or other item about which I am commenting</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment B is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which does not include Segment B.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
882	3/16/2023	Jeff Lang	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
883	4/4/2023	Jeff Marquardt	Email	Hello Stephen, My comment for final tie-in on the east end of this project should to coordinate with McKinney Airport Terminal Expansion. While it is up for bond voting soon this year...my belief is that it will pass, and traffic to and from the airport expansion to the east should work with this project Sincerely, Jeff Marquardt 730 Cross Fence Drive McKinney, TX 75069	Your comment is noted. This US 380 EIS project and the Spur 399 Extension project are separate projects with independent utility. Both Segments C and D can be connected to the Spur 399 Preferred Alternative and that is how they were evaluated in the DEIS. The decision for the US 380 Preferred Alternative is not based on the Preferred Alternative for Spur 399. TxDOT has and will continue to work with City of McKinney staff on both projects.
884	1/13/2023	Jeff Parsons	Online	Mr Endres, I just saw that the Hwy 380 plan will not affect Manegait. I want to say that I am so relieved for this outstanding organization.	Your comment is noted.
885	4/20/2023	Jeff R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, Yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
886	3/10/2023	Jeff Roberts	Email	Our family lives just south of Custer and 380 and as a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I don't understand why TxDOT has seemingly dismissed an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. Has there been undue or unethical influence on TxDOT by property owners bordering Segment B? I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for your attention, Jeff Roberts	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
887	3/16/2023	Jeff Stutes	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
888	1/25/2023	Jeff T	Online	Do not increase the road traffic and complexity putting the top of the funnel in my town right next to my neighborhood (right at the intersection of coit and 380 where our high school is) to decrease traffic in an adjacent town. Build the *entire* bypass well into McKinney if McKinney needs a bypass. With the funnel in Prosper we will see the traffic building right in one of our already most populated and busiest areas.	Your comment is noted. Please note TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper. TxDOT is conducting four schematic projects to build a freeway throughout Collin County.
889		Jeffery S Flanagan	Comment Form	A is strongly preferred over B! Thank you for realizing this.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
890	3/16/2023	Jeffrey Alexopulos	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
891	4/20/2023	Jeffrey B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	YES to segment B.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
892	4/20/2023	Jeffrey G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	B-E-C just makes sense.-OR- go up top over 380 in McKinney where existing right-of-way is not wide enough.	Your comment and support of Segments B, E, and C is noted. Double decked (or elevated) freeway sections were considered during the Feasibility Study. It will not be further considered for the corridor because it would not substantially reduce the amount of right-of-way needed to construct the roadway, and it would be more expensive. It's important to note that TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove elevated freeways in several locations across the state, including I-35 in downtown Austin.
893	4/20/2023	Jeffrey R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
894	2/18/2023	Jeffrey Smith	Online	Preference is for option A. It is inconceivable to me how Texas has so poorly planned for know growth coming. This clearly should have been addressed 20-30 years ago. Not now !	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A.
895	4/20/2023	Jenna Duffy	Email	<p>Hi Stephen,                      A few comments and questions are below. Additional comments have been attached.                      TxDOT's introduction of the Segment A shift without notice and in addition to the already flawed analysis that produced a preference for Segment A creates an unfair burden on the residents of Tucker Hill. Once again, TxDOT appears to be showing a callous bias toward 'future development' rather than a commitment to current residents. It is impossible to fully understand the additional noise pollution, air pollution and other effects without additional study. It's important to note that even with this new shifted Segment A, the cost to construct Segment B would be \$100M less than Segment A. TxDOT's actions are placing the residents of Tucker Hill in an untenable position and are knowingly causing irreparable harm to the community in favor of future development. I strongly object to the proposed shift of the A alignment. I am concerned about safety during construction and beyond and do not feel the study adequately addressed safety and access to our neighborhood during and after construction. Tucker Hill is a front-porch community by design and given the amount of time spent outside and in our community, I am concerned about air quality and noise and do not feel they were adequately addressed nor were our facilities and neighborhood type properly identified in the study. How will emergency response time be affected during construction period? Has TxDOT studied the full impact of air quality during and after construction? Where were the air quality monitors located for the current study? Was a study done to compare the safety of the turns on A compared to B? I don't understand the air quality measures used? Can you explain them to me. What will happen with overflow parking at Harvard Park into Tucker Hill when you take a row of parking?                      Jenna Duffy                      Email: [REDACTED]</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the Segment A shift is noted. The Segment A shift that was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The current design shows that TxDOT would likely need to acquire the land where the last row of parking is for the Harvard Park parking lot. TxDOT does not anticipate that additional right-of-way beyond what is described in the DEIS will be needed for the project. If the property owner chooses to reconfigure parking due to the TxDOT ROW acquisition, they would have to do so on their own property. During the TxDOT ROW acquisition process, TxDOT hires a third party to appraise to and assess any potential damage and if the building can still operate with its original purpose.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
896	4/20/2023	Jennifer and Glen Gonthier	Email	<p>Mr. Enders: As McKinney homeowners and taxpayers, specifically as homeowners and taxpayers who reside in Tucker Hill, we find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
897	4/20/2023	Jennifer Anne C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A is costly and extremely disruptive to already existing businesses and residential areas. Segment B does not impact near as many business and yet to be established homesites.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
898	4/20/2023	Jennifer Arnett	Email	<p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing to show my strong opposition for Segment A of HWY 380 expansion. I have a few points to address. First and foremost is that I am a resident of Tucker Hill who is protected under the ADA. I have sensory issues in which that a highway whose noise levels will exceed the legal decibel rating will quite literally drive me insane. Having a major freeway on top of my neighborhood will not only impact my quality of life but other residents of Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch who have sensory issues from either PTSD, Autism, ASD, etc. My other major concern is the pollution from the construction and eventual traffic from this major highway. As a lifelong asthmatic, this is very troubling to me. Being able to breathe without wheezing or relying on an inhaler to breathe is a right that shouldn't be taken away from anyone. How can you guarantee that my health won't be affected by this poorly chosen route? You can't. I don't believe that TXDOT has done due diligence on environmental impacts to the existing wetlands and this route would wipe out a significant amount of 150 year old trees and essential wildlife. There is another route that wouldn't wipe out wetlands, historic trees, planned hike and bike trails by the City of McKinney, business or existing homes. It would also save taxpayers in excess of TWO HUNDRED MILLION dollars. Why does TXDOT think it can just spend money like that when there is clearly another option that is more economical, sensible, responsible and in the best interest of those living near the proposed route A? I don't believe the studies TXDOT has done paint an accurate picture of the noise and pollution levels that route A will bring to the residents of Tucker Hill, Auburn Hills and Stonebridge Ranch. I believe it is in TXDOTS best interest to choose a different route or majorly revise Route A to protect businesses, homes and residents that are currently standing and not "proposed" communities or businesses. Thank you,</p> <p>Jennifer Arnett  2716 Majestic Ave  McKinney, TX 75071  Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S21 Ultra 5G, an AT&amp;T 5G smartphone</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
899	2/6/2023	Jennifer Aycock	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
900	4/20/2023	Jennifer C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I oppose segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
901	4/20/2023	Jennifer C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
902	4/20/2023	Jennifer C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Cheaper, less impact to property holder, less congestion and pollution, more traffic actually bypassed. Seems like a no brainer.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
903	4/20/2023	Jennifer C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
904	3/14/2023	Jennifer Carter	Email	<p>Mr Endres -  I know you've received every engineered comment possible. So I will give you my very simple but honest concerns. You all need to stop this nonsense. You know what is right - what is wrong. It is wrong to hurt many for one. It is wrong to create chaos for communities of 20 years or more than to build in newer communities just beginning. It is wrong to spend millions when it is not necessary - it's stealing. It is wrong that one wealthy voice overrides a community of many. It is wrong in this State of Texas to not be fair. There is only one conclusion to come too - a bully has a vendetta and you all have let him win. It's sad. Especially sad here in Texas. So that is it. I told my community I would send a comment - and here it is. You already know all of this - and my little existence is nothing to you all - but we moved to our home in McKinney in Tucker Hill for the love of the community as many did - and you all have once again proved that the deep pockets don't really care about the little man.</p> <p>Sincerely,  J. Carter  Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
905	3/9/2023	Jennifer Claunch	Online	I cannot understand how Option A vs Option B meets any of the criteria for a preferred route for the bypass. First, option B bypasses a larger segment of 380. Second, it represents a more gentle return to 380, resulting in easier traffic flow, higher speeds, so less sitting and polluting at lower speeds. Fewer homes are in the path, and far fewer existing businesses. I believe Option B would represent less traffic hazards for school children driving and bussing from south of 380 to schools north of 380 during the construction. I strongly favor Option B and feel existing properties and businesses should carry more weight than potential future growth. And finally, Option B is far less costly. It could be completed more quickly. Time is money.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix. Our comparison of Segments A and B showed that there was not a substantial difference in traffic metrics such as travel times, travel speeds, and Level of Service.
906	2/24/2023	Jennifer DeLano	Email	Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Jennifer DeLano	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
907	3/10/2023	Jennifer Ellis	Email	Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jennifer Ellis 8504 Beech Ln McKinney, TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
908	4/2/2023	Jennifer Eubank	Email	Senator Paxton, Representative Leach, and Mr. Endres: I am writing to express my opposition to Segment C and my support for Segment D. I support Segment D because of its reduced impact on the environment and the lower number of homes, businesses, and community services that would be negatively impacted in comparison to Segment C. Furthermore, the Texas Parks and Wildlife department also prefers Segment D because they recognize the disastrous environmental impact that Segment C would have. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Regards, Jennifer Eubank	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
909	2/25/2023	Jennifer Fortenbury	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, With great respect, I ask that you consider my comments below regarding the 380 bypass. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Reasons to consider OPPOSING Segment A:</p> <p>Costs taxpayers \$98.8 million more Impacts 57% more natural wetlands &amp; wildlife Negatively impacts Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods</p> <p>Reasons to SUPPORT Segment B: Requires 73% fewer business and residential displacements Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at U.S. 380 &amp; Custer Road 14% shorter, saving time and money</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Jennifer Fortenbury</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
910	4/20/2023	Jennifer H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote no to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
911	3/16/2023	Jennifer Hagee	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jennifer Hagee</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
912	3/14/2023	Jennifer Lorenzo	Email	<p>Please help us save our beautiful community!!                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.                      Sincerely,                      Jennifer Lorenzo                      Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
913	2/6/2023	Jennifer Murley	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
914	3/31/2023	Jennifer Pruitt	Email (2)	<p>Dear Mr. Endres, I oppose using Segment C of the 380 bypass and prefer using Segment D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Using segment D would disrupt fewer citizens and households.</li> <li>2. Using segment D would not disturb the forest land or wild life areas, or at least less disruption to natural areas.</li> </ol> <p>Progress is good as long as it makes sense. It doesn't make sense to disturb 22 citizen families for segment C, when there is less impact on citizen families for segment D.</p> <p>Graciously, Jennifer Pruitt Mckinney, TX</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p>
915	4/20/2023	Jennifer S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
916	4/5/2023	Jennifer Sutherland	Voicemail	Hi this is Jennifer Sutherland. My phone number is (214)-558-1007 and my address is 700 Sutherland Dr., McKinney, TX, 75071. Just calling to make sure you guys consider the students that are zoned for McKinney North, that drive from the stonebridge area, Stonebridge and 380. Um all of those students that are in that neighborhood, new 16 year old drivers. Drive on 380 to get to McKinney North at Wilmeth and Hardin area. So our preferred 380 bypass entrance would be west of that area over in Prosper. I've also been told that it costs less money. I've also been told that it effects less residential. I think that the traffic entering in to go west would be less there. The bulk of stonebridge neighborhood and all surrounding neighborhoods head east on 380 to go grocery shopping at kroger, um to go to the hospital at Baylor Scott and White. I think it impacts a lot more residents and student drivers on 380 if you put it by 380 and Stonebridge versus putting it west out in Prosper. So my vote would be the 3rd or 4th option, the gold or the brown option. And the recent information that I read online, and so just wanted to cast my vote. Thanks. Bye.	Your comment is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.  While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
917	2/17/2023	Jennifer Swim	Online	I oppose route C parcel 403, and prefer route D. Route C destroys my home that my family has lived on since 2011. It displaces my parents out of their house as well as the horse rescue they own. Many people and animals will be affected in this route C option. Many more residents will be displaced with this option as opposed to route D.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.
918	2/16/2023	Jennifer Swim	Paper form	Oppose C Route. The Route goes directly through my house and displaces my family with two children. Parcel 403 is the area that destroys my house.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
919	3/7/2023	Jennifer Watkins	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
920	4/20/2023	Jenny A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
921	4/2/2023	Jenny Ahlemeyer	Email	Mr. Endres, NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jenny Ahlemeyer	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
922	3/8/2023	Jenny Kaiser	Email	Hello, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks, Jenny Kaiser	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
923	3/16/2023	Jenny Maxey	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
924	2/21/2023	Jeremy Baker	Online	<p>As a resident of the Willow Wood community, I would like to express my interest in section D and oppose section C. Section D would have much less of an impact on the hundreds of residents in this area. Section C would come just below the southern edge of my property as well as many others here. We bought in this neighborhood for its country feel and would be devastated by a huge freeway that would be close enough to see!</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>
925	3/14/2023	Jeremy Lowry	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, Jeremy Lowry</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
926	3/6/2023	Jeremy Puckett	Email	<p>NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jeremy Puckett JEREMY PUCKETT General Manager Operations O: 972.801.3990   M: 469.534.6092 [REDACTED] www.chrobinson.com 8454 Parkwood Blvd   Suite 200   Plano, TX 75024</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
927	4/20/2023	Jerri U	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A...Yes to Segment B Please	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
928	4/20/2023	Jerry & Connie K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO for plan A & YES with plan B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
929	4/20/2023	Jerry B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Another instance of not considering tax payers and supporting the most expensive and disruptive plan. No to Plan A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.
930	3/22/2023	Jerry Bradley	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. A is more expensive, more disruptive and destructive, and did I say more expensive? Government acts as if they have a money. It's not your money so you don't care how bad you hurt retired people like myself. Collin County is becoming a place where ex teachers can't afford to live. Take the least expensive alternative for once. Support Plan B. Jerry Bradley	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
931	2/28/2023	Jerry Horton	Email	I wish to advise you to please vote NO to segment A and YES to segment B. I am a homeowner in Stonebridge Ranch, specifically LaCima Meadows facing Custer near Stonebridge Drive. I strongly support segment B and urge you to please vote YES for that proposal. Jerry Horton 1208 Winter Haven Lane McKinney, TX 75071 214.592.4147	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
932	4/20/2023	Jerry P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A - Yes to Segment B!!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
933	4/3/2023	Jerry Patrick	Stonebridge Comment	4/3/2023 Jerry Patrick No to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, JERRY PATRICK	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
934	3/16/2023	Jerusha Sykes	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
935	4/20/2023	Jessica E	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
936	2/6/2023	Jessica Garcia	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
937	2/27/2023	Jessica Garcia	Email	<p>Good afternoon Mr. Endres,</p> <p>My name is Jessica Garcia and I am concerned about the 380 bypass that will take place on the NE part of McKinney. I live in an area that will be affected severely if segment C is chosen. I as well as all my neighbors support segment D as it would cause less damage to the remaining forests in central Collin County. If segment C is chosen it would destroy about 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% of grassland and prairie which would also eliminate a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species. Segment C will also affect and displace more homes businesses and community resources. In all honesty segment C would create more problems than solutions. I know it's a tough decision but supporting segment D would be more beneficial for everyone. Please support segment D. Thank you,</p> <p>Jessica Garcia</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>
938	4/20/2023	Jessica M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I don't want a Highway by my house. The environmental impact would be devastating. I love my home and neighborhood. My husband and I worked very to build this home and this community. I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
939	2/26/2023	Jessica Nunn	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you,</p> <p>Jessica nunn</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
940	4/20/2023	Jessica V	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The right choice is Segment B, donth right thing!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
941	3/14/2023	Jessica Vargas	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jessica Vargas	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
942	3/16/2023	Jessica Wyrich	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
943	2/17/2023	Jessie Dortch	Email	Hello. My name is Jessie Dortch and I would like to voice my opposition to the 380 bypass (route C). The bypass would destroy the property owned by a good friend. This property serves as a place for therapeutic horse riding, community rides, events, and church services. The bypass would go directly through the riding arena and honey bee area on the property, and the noise from the highway would be incredibly detrimental to the animals. I would instead like to voice support of route D. It crosses through the flood plain, and would only disrupt 7 homes instead of 29. Thank you for listening, and I hope you will consider the impact of route C on the people and animals that call the area home. Thank you, J Dortch	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
944	3/10/2023	Jill Ables	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
945	2/19/2023	Jill Nugent	Online	I am encouraged that the EIS Recommendation is to Keep 380 on 380 along its current footprint in the Town of Prosper. Thank you for listening to feedback from the Town of Prosper, Prosper ISD, and citizens of Prosper to Keep 380 on 380 in Prosper. The Town of Prosper is a committed regional transportation partner and we have planned for the 380 expansion along its current footprint.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
946	2/22/2023	Jill Price	Online	I strongly believe that the option chosen is the wrong option. It impacts too many homes and businesses as well as impacts the environment in a negative way. The better option is the B, E, D route. I also believe the fly by video is misleading as I do not believe the retail in front of Tucker Hill will be spared and I have been told that the overpass will not be up and over but more rollers which will create in insane amount of noise.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. In regard to the retail businesses in front of Tucker Hill, TxDOT is still considering options for design in the area. The current two designs show impact to the first row of parking and not the businesses structures. If the interchange you are referencing is the interchange of future 380 and existing 380, the mainlanes will be elevated above the existing US 380 and the freeway frontage roads. If you are referencing Tremont, the entrance to Tucker Hill, the freeway mainlanes would be depressed (below grade). The frontage roads would be at grade and offer access to the neighborhood via Tremont Road.
947	4/20/2023	Jill S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is cheaper and impacts fewer people. Please reconsider the decision.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.
948	4/20/2023	Jillian H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A. Strongly support B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
949	4/20/2023	Jim B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Against this route, I understand it costs more and will disrupt more than the other route	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
950	4/20/2023	Jim H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Go South. Tie in to 121/399 and get back on 380 at DNT. 380 Loop south go much further North. Current options are pointless. The area will be saturated before current plan can even begin.	Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The options that you mention would not address these needs.
951	3/7/2023	Jim Hysaw	Email	As a citizen of McKinney, TX and resident homeowner in the Stonebridge Ranch Community living near the intersection of Custer Road and 380, I strongly "OPPOSE the construction of Segment A" for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to the 36,000 residents who live with me in the Stonebridge Ranch Community as well as the thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to "implement Segment B" as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jim Hysaw Jim Hysaw 8509 Gallery Way McKinney, TX 75072 [REDACTED] 214-837-4416	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
952	4/20/2023	Jim M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to the A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
953	4/20/2023	Jim N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
954	3/7/2023	Jim Norton	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from Mail for Windows	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
955	4/20/2023	Jim P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
956	3/28/2023	Jim Reyes	Email	Have those that will decide Segment "A" versus Segment "B" the crucial extra time to navigate from Stonebridge Ranch to have emergency "first responders" meet fire and health situations, especially in transport to medical facilities like Baylor Scott White where every minute "COUNTS"! Sent from my iPhone	Your comment is noted.
957	2/25/2023	Jim Rice	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Jim Rice	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
958	4/19/2023	Jim Smith	Email	<p>To whom it may concern:                      I have attached a document with comments and views based on extensive research regarding your proposed Segment A choice and ask that you take these findings to heart and reconsider your current position and choose Segment B as the best option for current and future growth to our NW quadrant of the City.                      In addition to the attached comments:                      1. My wife has health issues that require multiple Doctor visits and health screenings and I am concerned about safety during construction and beyond and do not feel the study adequately addressed safety and access to our neighborhood during and after construction.                      Will there be ease of access entering and exiting Tucker Hill?                      How will emergency response time be affected during construction?                      Where is the study to compare the safety of turns on Segment A compared to Segment B?                      Best Regards,                      Jim Smith                      972-898-8345</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
959	2/6/2023	Jim Taliaferro	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
960	2/6/2023	Jimmy Sullivan	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
961	2/20/2023	Jimmy Wilson	Email	<p>Dear Stephen Endres,                      Even though I reside in the Atlanta, Georgia area, my wife and I are lifelong friends of Collins County ranch owner, Rebecca Smith. The ranch is used by the community for Therapeutic Riding as well as riding for church and community events. The ranch will be damaged by proposed Spur 399 Extension Section C, and would no longer be usable for horses and riding. There is a proposed Extension Section D which would impact seven homes, while Section C impacts 29 homes, 15 businesses and seven community resources. Section C will also destroy one of the largest remaining forests in central Collins County. My wife and I join with Collins County Ranch Owner, Rebecca Smith to urge the selection of Section D for the Spur 399 project. Thank you for your kind consideration. Sincerely,                      Dr. Jimmy and Deborah Wilson                      2865 Adams Pointe Drive                      Snellville, GA 30078</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
962	4/3/2023	Jo	Email	<p>Please see attached my comments on the U.S. 380 bypass through McKinney. In particular, I am concerned that the EIS does not account for the sound impact of the elevated roadway portion that crosses Wilson Creek within a short distance of several neighborhoods, and that the ambiguity on the location of the turn north (i.e., "shifted" Segment A) mean that the true comparative impact has not been assessed. I am strongly opposed to Segment A and favor Segment B, which is a lower impact, more direct, and less expensive alternative.</p> <p>Erik Baumgarten 2712 Majestic Ave McKinney, TX</p> <p>As a McKinney resident, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B ignores the findings of the environmental study, applies criteria to support this decision inconsistently, is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers and places an unsupportable financial burden on the City of McKinney and its taxpayers.</p> <p>Findings of the Environmental Impact Study should have led to selection of Segment B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No businesses displaced, rather than 15 current businesses displaced in Segment A.</li> <li>● 2 rather than 7 major utility conflicts in Segment A</li> <li>● No hazardous material sites impacted, rather than 2 in Segment A.</li> <li>● Nearly twice the impact to rivers and streams; ½ mile vs. 1 mile</li> <li>● Segment A impacts more than 30 irreplaceable Heritage trees, aged over 150 years.</li> </ul> <p>Segment B saves over \$150 million dollars for Collin County Taxpayers vs. Segment A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● \$153M in right of way costs, rather than \$198M in Segment A.</li> <li>● \$25M in utility relocation costs, rather than \$75 in Segment A.</li> <li>● \$588M in design and construction costs rather than \$608M in Segment A.</li> <li>● \$40M savings in utility relocation for the City of McKinney.</li> </ul> <p>TXDOT's own findings indicate that the continued emphasis on ManeGait is unwarranted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The design updates to Segment B have fully mitigated any impact to ManeGait</li> <li>● TXDOT has received a copy of a study from Shea Center &amp; Dreamcatchers, California service ranch with a similar project that impacted their area which found there was minimal impact.</li> <li>● TXDOT has said that Segment B "would not make the ManeGait inaccessible to persons with disabilities and would not violate the Americans with Disabilities Act"</li> </ul> <p>Priority has not been given to safety and the increased risk of fatal accidents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Segment A contains two 90 degree turns with a change of grade which</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. TxDOT is also still evaluating the impacts of the Segment A shift which was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing. It did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>will present a greater risk of fatal accidents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● TXDOT did not reveal the comparison between fatality analysis for Segment A &amp; B</li> </ul> <p>Segment A involves reconstructing an additional 3.8 miles of existing 380 Highway increasing the risk of work zone accidents, and disrupting existing traffic patterns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● According to TXDOT, 26,000 work zone crashes in 2021 resulted in 244 deaths.</li> <li>● The extended construction time required to regrade the existing road bed will increase the disruption to existing traffic for several years of construction.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria used to support Segment selection was not applied consistently. The criteria applied to recommend Segment C, would conclude Segment B is the preferred option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● C vs. D was compared based on objective cost data</li> <li>● A vs. B comparison featured subjective measures, such as counting the number of comments submitted vs. objective facts</li> </ul> <p>The current TXDOT budget and plans do not include the mitigation measures necessary to address the impact of increased environmental and noise pollution, as well as concerning traffic hazards, for the current McKinney neighborhoods impacted by Segment A. In addition to the depressed roadway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A sound wall across the full length of Tucker Hill property fronting 380 consistent with the character of the entry being removed and providing privacy from cut thru traffic.</li> <li>● The extension of Stonebridge Drive and new entrance on Townsend Boulevard for Tucker Hill residents in the character of the current entrance at Tremont Boulevard.</li> </ul>	<p>35 interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT provides a summary of fatal and injury crashes by alternative on page 2-33 of the DEIS.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The current design shows that TxDOT would likely need to acquire the land where the last row of parking is for the Harvard Park parking lot. TxDOT does not anticipate that additional right-of-way beyond what is described in the DEIS will be needed for the project. If the property owner chooses to reconfigure parking due to the TxDOT ROW acquisition, they would have to do so on their own property. During the TxDOT ROW acquisition process, TxDOT hires a third party to appraise and assess any potential damage and if the building can still operate with its original purpose.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under “NEPA Assignment”, TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ’s NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>
963	4/20/2023	Jo Ann L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A. YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
964	4/20/2023	Joan B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	200 million more tax dollars for a worse solution is unacceptable.	Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.
965	4/20/2023	Joan D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NOOOOO to A . . .Use B instead	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
966	4/20/2023	Joanna P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	We STRONGLY oppose Segment A blue alternative route.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A and the Blue Alternative s noted.
967	4/18/2023	Joanna Phillips	Email	<p>Hello. We love our Stonebridge Ranch Community and we love living in McKinney. There is no place quite like it. Peaceful, quiet, friendly, safe. Segment A of the 380 bypass will ruin that. There is a better option with Segment B. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will COST less, REDUCE the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy FEWER businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you.</p> <p>Joanna Phillips Sent from my iPhone "Every child deserves a champion, an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection, and insists that they become the best that they can possibly be." ~Rita Pierson</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
968	4/20/2023	Joanne K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I find it difficult to understand how this can be a viable option - right in the middle of large residential areas. What are you thinking? Which landowners/investors paid off State officials? Please do not destroy our peace and neighborhoods with the noise and air pollution of a freeway. NO TO SEGMENT A!!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.  None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
969	4/20/2023	Joanne P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	US 380 Proposed Route - NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
970	4/20/2023	Joanne T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Not just Stonebridge but also Tucker Hill as well. Absolutely No to A and yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
971	4/20/2023	Joanne T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A! Yes to B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
972	3/14/2023	Jocelyn Hudson	Email	Good afternoon, Stephen. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jocelyn Hudson	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
973	4/20/2023	Jodi L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
974	4/20/2023	Jodi W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to A. C, E, B makes more sense to me.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segments C, E, and B is noted.
975	2/6/2023	Jody Sullivan	Segment C Petition (2)	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
976	4/20/2023	Joe C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Why in the world would they select the more expensive option? They picked C over D; why not B over A?	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p> <p>One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p>
977	2/20/2023	Joe Closs	Online	<p>Two comments:  Segment B is about a mile shorter than segment A. Either segment will impact homes, two for segment A versus five for segment B. Surely the cost of the three additional homes for segment B is significantly less than the cost of an additional mile of roadway construction.  Also, it's a bypass. Segment B bypasses more of existing US 380 than segment A.</p>	Your comments are noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
978	3/16/2023	Joe Closs	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
979	4/20/2023	Joe H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I strongly support segment. Segment B and oppose Segment A. If you have to do one or the other, Segment B is the only logical choice.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>
980	4/20/2023	Joe M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>
981	3/16/2023	Joe Miranda	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
982	3/15/2023	Joe Mossinger	Email	<p>Hi Mr. Endres,                      I am writing to you to share my STRONG opposition to the bypass and Option B running through Prosper. I am a resident of Whitley Place and have been for the last seven years and disagree with the bypass running through Prosper for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12+ lanes going right through Prosper (8 lanes &amp; 4+ access lanes on either side) with the magnitude equal to US 75, located just south of Founders Academy</li> <li>• US 380 Bypass Segment B options + approved Collin Outer Loop (4-6 lanes) just north would sandwich NE &amp; SE Prosper in between 2 major highway thoroughfares</li> <li>• Directly affects and disruptive to numerous neighborhoods: Whitley Place, Whispering Farms, Brookhollow, Christie Farms, Rhea Mills, Gentle Creek, Amberwood, Ladera, etc.</li> <li>• Prosper properly planned for expansion (380 can be widened!). If other towns didn't plan this can't be put on Prosper</li> <li>• Directly impacts multiple schools in Prosper ISD: Cockrell Elementary   Rogers Middle School   Walnut Grove High School and Founders Classical Academy and student drivers</li> <li>• Increased Traffic and Noise</li> <li>• Materially impacts ManeGait and the wonderful therapy they provide to children, veterans, and our disabled community</li> <li>• Exorbitant costs of acquiring rights of way, adverse environmental impacts, wetland mitigation</li> <li>• This design does not make for an acceptable proposal nor effective use of taxpayer money</li> <li>• School buses having to go on a highway to take kids to school / young drivers for the high school having to deal with highways and high speeds</li> <li>• Significant environmental impact: pollution, emissions, &amp; poor air quality</li> <li>• Safety of our citizens and students</li> <li>• Decreased home values and overall desire of area</li> <li>• Massive utility relocations that are critical to Prosper's infrastructure</li> <li>• Substantial lost tax revenue to the Town and Prosper ISD</li> </ul> <p>In closing, I highly oppose Option B and want 380 to stay on 380 or Option A to be considered. Thank you,                      Joe Mossinger                      4060 Chimney Rock Drive                      Prosper, Texas 75078</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment B is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which does not include Segment B.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
983	3/31/2023	Joe Sadowy	Email	<p>Mr Endres- I have to imagine you receive thousands of emails and messages from homeowners and residents complaining about the work you do. It seems everyone is a supporter of progress and development, as long as it does not happen in their backyard. I am a resident of McKinney and live fairly close to HWY 380 near Stonebridge Drive. Our HOA provides us updates and information regarding the process and the planning that impacts Stonebridge Ranch. Recently, they provided data suggesting that TXDOT appears to be close to making decisions on the new Hwy 380 Bypass. The information states that TXDOT appears to favor an option A for the location of the beginning of the loop construction on the western end rather than option B. They also provided data that indicates that option A will be significantly more expensive than B. The information also stated that option A will destroy more existing businesses and residences than option B in the construction of the roadway. As you can imagine, this does not sound reasonable to me. Why would TXDOT proceed with a more expensive and more intrusive construction plan when there is a viable and more appealing option available? Admittedly I would prefer this new construction to happen away from my current residence for obvious reasons. However, if the least expensive, least intrusive option was next to my residence, I would understand.</p> <p>I have two requests: 1-If you are reviewing and tracking responses from McKinney residents like me, please record my feedback as a formal request for option B to be selected. 2-If there is information available from TXDOT that provides substantiation for the selection of option A, recognizing the additional expense and community impact. would you please provide the information to me? Thank you very much for your consideration I appreciate your help Joe Sadowy 1417 Montclair Cir McKinney TX 75071 214-392-3335</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with FHWA NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p>
984	4/20/2023	Joel P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to segment B.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
985	2/22/2023	Johanna Mattox	Online	AGAINST Segment A. It's more money to build, effects way more people, more home owners (and not just the people off of 380.) Will effect more business, more noise etc. If a 380 bypass- why are we not bypassing parts of 380 that need to be bypassed? Custer to Hardin is very pretty now, and the intersection of Custer and 380 would be awful! Might as well be Custer & 121! Seems TXDOT cares more about "future" home development of Prosper, and a horse facility that can go elsewhere, and NOT about the people who have lived in McKinney for years. Its about rich people of Prosper and not the rest of us. The construction alone for YEARS will have everyone on Virginia Rd, that will be awful! This will greatly effect our taxes/property values. Not to mention the importance of our daily lives and driving in the "SUBURB" area we love. So much for our UNIQUE by nature- McKinney. PLEASE do B that makes sense and impacts less of our lives, and costs less. And my comments are from MANY people I know.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will develop a detailed traffic control plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction.
986	4/20/2023	John A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I want below grade when passing by stonebridge ranch	Your comment is noted. The design presented does show the mainlanes between Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill below grade.
987	3/28/2023	John and Nancy Pemberton	Email	Mr Stephen Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, John and Nancy Pemberton	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
988	4/19/2023	John and Peggy Firestone	Email	Mr. Endres.... I am writing you because I am extremely concerned about the 380 bypass. My husband and I live in Tucker Hill which is directly off 380. We are an elderly couple and my husband has several heart and health issues. I am concerned because of the noise, traffic and confusion that will be taking place in our neighborhood. First, there is questions about whether houses will be taken down. We are already seeing many neighbors putting their house up for sale. Second, we have found out that the noise is it going to be a very large problem. Proper testing has not been done to any of our knowledge. Sound walls and protection for our community has not properly been studied The route labeled plan A is much more costly and affects many more of us than Plan B. Why would tax Dollars be used for this plan when they could save so much I using Plan B. The Billingsley property which is nearby and just recently started construction seems to have had a great impact on why one plan was picked over the other.. Our	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.  Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>neighborhood has a porch style neighborhood which has proved to be a wonderful addition to McKinney. We are hopeful that some of our concerns could be revisited to say that there is reason to choose Plan B. It will save money , disturb fewer neighborhoods, and be a wiser choice. Please explain why spending more money and disturbing more neighborhoods is being picked for the path to be used. Many of us do not understand why the Outerloop couldn't be used to solve the problem and be an answer to help in traffic north of our area as well as help the traffic on 380. Has that ever been thought of as the path. If you connect The northern towns that bring much traffic to our area with Hwy 75 they could even br brought into the North Dallas Tollway easily by using the already designated Outer Loop.. this area is one of the fastest growing areas and tearing up a few blocks of 380 will hardly handle that traffic in a few years. Respectfully submitted,                      John and Peggy Firestone                      Tucker Hill Residents.                      I                      Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. TxDOT conducted a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis including benzene and VOCs (Section 3.12.3 of the DEIS), and a Carbon Monoxide Traffic Air Quality analysis (Section 3.12.2 of the DEIS), included in Appendix P of the DEIS. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 TIP.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
989	3/9/2023	John and Wendy Corcoran	Email	Hello, As homeowners and citizens of McKinney, Texas, we OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, we understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. We strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, John and Wendy Corcoran	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
990	4/20/2023	John B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A; Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
991	3/9/2023	John Balkovec	Email	March 9, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden o McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in ;less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely John Balkovec P.S. As I commented on in a previous letter to TxDOT, I do not understand why the connection of the 380 Bypass to the Dallas North Tollway is not considered at this time in lieu of 'A' or 'B'. I suspect that your overall studies have already identified a connection of 380 to the tollway further north than its current location, i.e., the outer loop, sent from I phone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.  Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.  It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
992	3/16/2023	John Bickel	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, In connection with the proposed by routes referenced above I would like to express my opposition to segment C as proposed. Based on the available impacts both natural and human it seems that segment D is a vastly more favorable option. As a longtime Collin County resident and regular user of this Highway I ask you also oppose segment C in favor of segment D. Thank you for your time and service to the State of Texas. Regards, John Bickel	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
993	4/20/2023	John C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A and YES to Segment B!!! It's obvious that Segment B is the best way to go with all the data that has been collected. Please TxDOT make the right decision-Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
994	4/20/2023	John Cisar	Email	Dear Mr. Enders, I have several issues with TxDOT's proposed 380 expansion and alignment of option A.  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
995	3/28/2023	John DeLoma	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, John DeLoma 7605 Willowbend Dr McKinney, TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
996	4/20/2023	John G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option B is less expensive and less disruptive. All the evidence presented in the studies make it the obvious choice. Please reconsider selecting Option B as the proposed choice from Coit Rd to FM 1827	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
997	3/21/2023	John Gidney	Online	<p>Good Morning, My wife and I own what I believe is property 183 on your site plan on the North side of Tucker Hill. I'm writing to ask that you make a small adjustment to your plan. Our property line on the north side is basically where the bridge for your service road is going to begin. All I'm asking is that you push the beginning of the bridge about twenty feet to the south to allow me to put a entrance to our property. My family has lived in McKinney for over 100 years and I thought I had a place for the next 100 but this is throwing a wrench into that plan. But driving on 380 everyday myself I know its needed. We have tried to take this whole process in stride, but its been pretty tough to swallow as you can imagine. I have attached a photo with the location circled. Hopefully this small request will be a lot easier to be made if we can take care of it before the project moves forward. Thank you for your time. John Gidney</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Our design team will take your suggested change into consideration and further evaluate the possibility of shortening the bridges. TxDOT is looking at reducing all bridge lengths to try to reduce the cost of the project.
998	3/28/2023	John Grey	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, John Grey</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
999	3/7/2023	John Hamilton	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of Prosper , TX., I strongly SUPPORT the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I strongly urge you to implement Segment A as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827 and appreciate the time and attention taken to resolve this route issue. Thank you for keeping 380 on 380 through Prosper. John Hamilton</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1000	2/17/2023	John Hancock	Online	We are very concerned about the large number of families who would be displaced by Segment C when Segment D would impact far fewer homes. Segment C would also adversely impact much more forest land than Segment D.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway.</p>
1001	1/26/2023	John Helmer	Email	<p>Stephen, We live in East McKinney and are not in the direct path of this proposed Hwy 380 bypass work, but I continue to believe it is a waste of money and a needless assault on rural life. I don't believe the bypass will have any meaningful effect on Hwy 380 congestion. It is a poorly conceived knee-jerk project that fails to relieve the dense traffic on Hwy 380 from Denton to Princeton. Collin Co. missed the opportunity to expand Hwy 380 perhaps 30 years ago and now there are no easy options. I urge TXDOT to back-peddle on this and look into more useful and permanent remedies. How about spending some of that \$33 billion state war chest on something visionary, a 50 year solution? Should all these roads have free use? What about collaborating with NTTA to toll an express component on the original right of way? That has worked pretty well on 635 in Dallas. Thanks. John Helmer McKinney, Tx 214-504-9935</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition to the project is noted. You can find information about the traffic analysis that was conducted for the Blue Alternative in the DEIS. Please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.</p> <p>Coordination has been ongoing between TxDOT and NTTA, however, tolling is not being considered as a funding option for this project.</p>
1002	4/20/2023	John J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	in favor of Segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1003	3/7/2023	John Kavulich	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. John Kavulich 713 Marioneth Dr McKinney TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1004	4/20/2023	John L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am vehemently opposed to Segment A. strongly support Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1005	4/20/2023	John M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1006	4/20/2023	John M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1007	2/17/2023	John Manton	Email	I strongly encourage that TXDOT utilize Route D as the best option for our city. The houses and business shouldn't be touched and the floodplain is the best option. We use business in the path of C and losing those would be devastating to the community and our needs. Thank you, John Manton	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1008	3/21/2023	John Mazzolini	Email	Good morning Stephen, My vote is for the Brown Alternative. I'll spare you the reasoning and long explanation for this choice as I'm sure you have heard the same thing from others and are aware of everything due to TXDOT's extensive research. You are welcome to reach out any time. Have a good day! Kind regards, John	Your comment and support of the Brown Alternative is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1009	2/19/2023	John Nugent	Online	We are encouraged to see the EIS recommendation to Keep 380 on 380 in Prosper. Thank you for listening to public input to Keep 380 on 380 in Prosper.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1010	3/16/2023	John Phillips	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1011	2/24/2023	John Solomon	Email	Stephen, I would like to express my thoughts on the HWY 380 project. Thanks fir your consideration. NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B Best Regards John 972-569-7669 [REDACTED]	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1012	4/20/2023	John W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1013	3/7/2023	John Worrall	Online	<p>I live at 7505 Cormac St in Tucker Hill and am, unsurprisingly, opposed to the Segment A route. Though it seems to be a foregone conclusion A will be built, why is the more cumbersome, winding, and expensive option the go-to choice? Therapeutic horses? There are 25+ other such facilities in North Texas. Anyone who regularly drives 380 in front of Tucker Hill knows the traffic problems are not there. They are further east (toward Lake Forest) and further west (toward Coit and the DNT). Or why not promptly build out the Collin County Outer Loop and use that instead? A few miles north to bypass the area is not too much to ask. In the end, though, if Segment A is built, PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE build a north exit out of Tucker Hill, preferably a permanent one. It would likely involve eminent domain, but a road that connects to FM 124 to the north would help a lot of people avoid years of traffic snarls. Thanks for opportunity to comment. I hope these comments are read!</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. A Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>Wilson Creek is north of the Tucker Hill neighborhood, making a northern access point to the neighborhood unlikely.</p>
1014	3/16/2023	John-Munn	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1015	2/6/2023	Johnnie Fisher	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1016	2/17/2023	Johnnie Howell	Online	<p>Our family is in opposition of section C, we fully support of section D as the preferred alternative. We are raising our young children on a 24 acre family ranch with horses, donkeys, and cows. If TxDOT chooses section C, specifically parcel 403, it will demolish our home where we have two children, our son is 11 months, and daughter is 5 years old. We have family gatherings on the property, we host bible studies, and we had planned to raise our family here.</p> <p>We are not the only family directly affected and displaced, when you look at sections C and D side by side, you will see that 4 times the residents and businesses are affected if route C is chosen. We all know roads can be built over flood planes, I know this is more expensive, but it's not right to choose C over D because of the flood planes and cost alone. Which is what it looks like you are basing your preference on. I will be sure to follow up with an email because I've used my allotted characters.</p> <p>Johnnie Howell</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.</p> <p>It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>
1017	2/16/2023	Johnnie Howell	Paper form	<p>Oppose C! Please take a second look at section D. I have a son under 9 years old and a 5-year old daughter who have been raised in our house (which is displaced by parcel 403). Section C affects and displaces more residents (29 for C, 7 for D), businesses (15 for C, 4 for D), and community resources (7 for C, 0 for D).</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1018	2/6/2023	Johnny Petway	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1019	4/20/2023	Jon A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1020	4/20/2023	Jon B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Greater cost, great negative impact to business and the environment. Effectively severs NE McKinney from McKinney.	Your comment is noted.
1021	2/26/2023 3/10/2023	Jon Bolen	Online (1) Email (1)	<p>To whom it may concern: I regret not being able to attend the public hearing. I believe a bypass is required to support growth in the northern corridor. However, I am thoroughly flummoxed at how TXDOT reached a decision to move forward with Segment A rather Segment B for this project. Let's first look at your somewhat disingenuous benefits for Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Displaces fewer homes 2 versus 5. Correct, however segment A is one mile longer, has seven potential major utility conflicts versus just two for Segment B and displaces 15 business versus zero. Additionally, Segment A encroaches on twice the wetland acreage, nearly twice the linear feet of rivers and streams and more acreage of forests, prairies and grasslands. Finally, the estimated cost to construct Segment A is nearly \$200M more than Segment B (unless the even more intrusive shift option is chosen, then increase is "only" \$100M).</li> <li>Results in lower potential impacts to planned future residential homes. Have we canvassed the "future residents" to measure the impact on their planned use of our community? I suspect the voices of the current residents should be a priority over unidentified residences.</li> <li>Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road. Once again, this appears to accrue to the benefit of future residents or current investors, not the current residents of the McKinney community.</li> <li>Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment. True, but the Segment A alignment effectively severs a portion of NW McKinney from our community and creates an island of residents who become more closely aligned with Propser than McKinney. We did not move to Prosper, we moved to McKinney.</li> <li>Avoids impact to MainGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern. This is pretty laughable. There is no great "public concern" over MainGait. Until this discussion arose, I would contend few people in the area even new of its existence. More concerning is that you call out the impact of the ROW to the founder's property. The founder of MainGait is no ordinary philanthropist, but, Bill Darling, a real estate developer and home builder who stands to gain personally by the selection of Segment A over B. Oh, to be certain, I have been to a MainGait 'charity' auction where well-heeled patrons bid tens of thousands of dollars for vacation packages and sports memorabilia. At the time, we all drove in</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>Planned future developments and proposed residences were identified through TxDOT's coordination with City of McKinney, Town of Prosper, and Collin County. Our project team reviewed planning and zoning commission status of each development. More detail can be found on the Segment Analysis Matrix at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/14%20Segment%20Analysis%20%28Displacements%29.pdf">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/14%20Segment%20Analysis%20%28Displacements%29.pdf</a>. Future developments were one of the many factors TxDOT had to consider when determining the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. Stonebridge Drive improvements are led by City of McKinney. TxDOT does not have jurisdiction of local streets with private developers.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>from Dallas to pay homage.</p> <p>What is missing from your comments and analysis is the impact on neighborhoods like Tucker Hill. Tucker Hill is an iconic neighborhood and destination for McKinney residents to celebrate special occasions. It is one of only two neighborhoods in the country developed by Southern Land as a front porch community. The Founders Square park does not just service the residents of the community, but is a destination for countless families as the backdrop for homecoming pictures, prom pictures and family photo shoots. A trip to the square on any given Saturday in the spring will find scores of young people in their most formal dress capturing memories. At Halloween, the streets are lined with residents from all over McKinney as children, young and old, try to recapture a touch of Americana. The Tucker Hill community welcomes them all with open arms. The sidewalks are nearly impassible and the laughter fills the evening well passed dusk. Finally, during the Holiday Season, when nearly every home is lit celebrating Christmas or Hanukkah the neighborhood is breathtaking and once again the streets fill with residents from the surrounding area so that they might recapture a touch of American tradition. Segment A will effectively sever Tucker Hill, a gem in the McKinney landscape, from our community. It appears there has been little to no thought of actions that could be taken to mitigate the impact of Segment A on our neighborhood. Some ideas for discussion and resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sound barrier has been proposed on the south side of the bypass, but essentially dismissed for the north side. A plan to erect a sound barrier and to partner with the neighborhood with funds earmarked to restore the aesthetic of the entrance at Tremont Boulevard (after construction of the bypass) would be helpful.</li> <li>• For years, Tucker Hill residents have waited to be connected to the McKinney trail system for cycling and walking. How could TXDOT partner with the city of McKinney to connect the neighborhood via trails to the broader community?</li> <li>• Finally, without detailed plans on an extension of Stonebridge Drive to facilitate a second manner of egress for the neighborhood, the residents can only envision complete isolation. What can TXDOT do to facilitate the progress of the Stonebridge Drive extension project and ensure amicable agreement between the City of McKinney and Southern Land Company?</li> </ul> <p>The support laid out for Segment B seems strained, at best, and more than a little biased towards a single individual or entity. The indifference to the facts and costs to construct Segment A (versus Segment B) seems irrational. The lack of mitigating strategies to offset the impact of a suboptimal strategy lacks empathy and foresight. I urge you to follow the data and reconsider your recommendation of Segment B for the bypass. If you cannot, I would challenge you to provide more complete recommendations to preserve the northwest McKinney community in earnest. Hopefully, we'll see you or your children at our fountain in the spring, on our sidewalks at Halloween or singing Christmas carols in December.</p>	<p>TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with FHWA NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p> <p>The scope of this project does include construction of ten-foot shared use paths on both sides of the roadway that would connect to trails shown in the City of McKinney future plans.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				Best Regards, Jon Bolen	
1022	4/19/2023	Jon Bolen	Email	<p>Stephen: I am a McKinney homeowner and I have lived in the Tucker Hill community since 2018. In 2020, my 82-year old mother purchased in the community about 12 doors down from my wife and I. We live on State Boulevard and can both see and hear US 380 from our front porch. We sat on the porch when we made our decision to buy the home. We can be found on our front porch, like many of our neighbors, on many evenings. In fact, we consider this outdoor space an integral part of our home. Naturally, we are concerned about the impact of the proposed 380 bypass on our lifestyle and ability to enjoy our property.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
1023	4/20/2023	Jon Dell'Antonia	Email	<p>Stephen Attached is a letter outlining two different alternatives to Segment A on the Project 380 bypass project. I hope you will take the time to read it and consider it seriously. Jon Dell'Antonia Board President Stonebridge Ranch Community Association</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
1024	1/13/2023	Jon Dell'Antonia	Email	<p>Stephen I just learned that you selected Route A for the connection back into Highway 380 just East of Custer Road. I am deeply disappointed in your decision. I thought you would make it based on facts developed by your project team which clearly pointed out that option Route B was the best solution, not politics. Obviously, I was wrong—politics won. I do not understand how you could select a route that is very disruptive causing many businesses to be removed and cost at least \$250 million more than Route B. Additionally, already under construction is a four lane divided road from 380 to Wilmeth which could easily connect to the bypass. Thus negating the need for another highway less than a mile away. I would appreciate hearing an explanation from you on the rationale you used to make this decision. Jon Dell'Antonia</p>	<p>Email response from TxDOT on 2/1/2023:</p> <p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>In the DEIS, we give a brief description on why TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative (Segments A+E+C). It is the alignment which travels between Stonebridge and Tucker Hill. The description is located in the DEIS on Page 2-38. DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (keepitmovingdallas.com)</p> <p>We can discuss more.</p> <p>Stephen Endres 214-320-4469</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1025	2/7/2023	Jon Dell'Antonia	Email	<p>Stephen                      While we disagree on the decision to recommend Segment A, I do appreciate your willingness to continue discussions with me. Your comment that we can discuss more is something I would like to pursue. Could we meet at the Feb 16th meeting to discuss? Realistically, what would it take for you to change the preferred option of A back to B? Is that even possible or are we just wasting our time? In reading your announcement, I note that you indicate it will displace 35 businesses and 22 homes. That is an incorrect statement. You may not be aware that as I write this email, there is construction going on East of Custer road of additional business and apartment complexes. I would estimate that hat the number of businesses impacted is closer to 50. Additionally,. there is a major apartment complex being constructed on the property proposed for Segment A. Your estimate of \$248 million for right of way acquisition is too low in my opinion. With all of the current and foreseeable construction, I believe it will be more in the range of \$400-\$500 million. As I have mentioned before, currently under construction is the expansion of Ridge Road from 380 to Wilmeth as a four lane divided highway. It is planned for extension to Bloomdale Road. That is essentially the route for segment A which begs the question on whether we need an additional road that does the same thing less than a mile West of this one. If you changed your decision to segment B, this would provide two routes to connect back into Highway 380 from the bypass (Ridge Road and the bypass connection in Prosper) instead of just one providing more options and a better experience for drivers. It would also be far less expensive. I know the city is disappointed that you selected Segment A over Segment B as B was their preferred route which they voted to approve, In addition to the city, the homeowners in Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch are also opposed as are the Billingley's who are currently constructing an apartment complex is the area defined for segment A. That is a significant number of people. Approximately at least 40,000 who are impacted. I look forward to further discussion with you.                      Jon Dell'Antonia                      972-540-5067</p>	<p>E-mail response from TxDOT on 2/7/2023:                      Yes, we can discuss at the February 16th public hearing.                      I would say it is rare that an alignment is changed, but that is why we hold public hearings and conduct public involvement.                      TxDOT is required to allow for review of the design schematics and DEIS. Things do come up where the design is changed even slightly.                      TxDOT does realize there is continued development around both alignments and impacts continue to increase above the numbers we show in DEIS.                      We try to be up to date at the time we write the Draft EIS.                      Stephen Endres                      Follow-up information: Please see the information for future developments provided in the Segment Analysis Matrix. The number of displacements in the DEIS and our Segment Analysis Matrix includes only developments (residential or commercia) already constructed and those that are expected to be constructed by the date TxDOT expects to receive the ROD.                      Throughout the Feasibility Study and EIS, TxDOT has been working with the City of McKinney on this project and all of their local roadway projects. The US 380 project would not have to be changed to accommodate for improvements to Ridge Road as currently planned.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1026	4/4/2023 4/20/2023	Jon DeShazo	Online (1) Email (1)	<p>Please reconsider Option B. It is less expensive, less disruptive, less complex option. I have attached additional comments about the justifications below.</p> <p><b>Please reconsider, and choose Option B.</b></p> <p>I am baffled that TxDOT prefers Option A, a decision that is \$90-190M more expensive and requires a more complex compressed, depressed section of road directly affecting two longestablished neighborhoods. My family have been residents of Tucker Hill since 2009. We are appalled at the massive disruption that TxDOT would put on our daily lives when such a dramatically less expensive, less disruptive, and simpler option is available. I do not understand how TxDOT would approve so much expansion of the 380/75 interchange, and the widening of 380 to six lanes between 75 and DNT, with no regard to a future limited access freeway. I was here for the DNT expansion north, and the 121 expansion east over the last 20 years. They were well planned over 30 years! We understood that 380 expansion was coming when we bought our home. We watched 380 expand to its logical right of way boundaries in our area. We were confident that the outer loop was coming—because of all the supposed planning around it. I have read the public documentation justifying Option A.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A and Support of Segment B, is noted.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1027	3/10/2023	Jonathan Adams	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1028	4/20/2023	Jonathan C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am sharing my voice that I'd like no to segment A and yes to segment B. From what I understand is that it costs less and least impact to the least amount of people and businesses. As a steward of taxpayer funds it is your duty to choose the most economical option which what I stated above.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1029	3/15/2023	Jonathan Cobb	Email	Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jonathan Cobb Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1030	3/28/2023	Jonathan Goldstein	Email	Mr. Endres: As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jonathan Goldstein, CSP-SM Cell (972) 832-4721 [REDACTED] Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1031	3/9/2023	Jonathan Kenney	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1032	3/21/2023	Joni Woodruff	Email	NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Joni Woodruff	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1033	3/14/2023	Jordan Hope	Email	Hi, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jordan Hope	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1034	2/27/2023	Jordan Thompson	Email	Mr. Endres, I'd like to lend my voice to the planning of the 380 Bypass in McKinney. I'm asking for your support of Option D. I am opposed to C. I've lived here for more than a decade. Simply put, Option C is more disruptive to the community. Option D would impact fewer homes. Option D would impact fewer farms. Option D would impact fewer businesses. The numbers speak for themselves. Option C fails to offer a compelling outcome. Neither the road performance, cost, nor environmental impact is persuasive. I'd be happy to elaborate further. Please contact me if you'd like to discuss the merits of these alternative choices. I would ask for your support of Option D. Thank you, Jordan Jordan Thompson, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP BD+C Director of Operations, Principal t 214.283.8864 m 469.534.3722	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.  It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.
1035	3/16/2023	Jorge Gonzalez	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1036	4/3/2023	Jorja Baumgarten	Online	I oppose segment C as drawn. The project details are vague and limited with regards to how access to the stickhorse estate's neighborhood will be maintained through out construction of not only this segment, but also the Princeton loop and the Spur which intersect at this location. Details of the surface streets are vague and even conflicting across the 3 project plans. This will disturb the access to over 30 homes for multiple years of construction. I favor moving the end of segment C slightly west, and providing clear surface street access to the neighborhoods north of 380 in the town of New Hope and it's surrounding ETJ, that will be available throughout the construction of these projects.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. Design in this area is still underway and will connect all three projects. A future Public Hearing for the Princeton project will be held to provide more details and an updated design. You can find project information and to sign up to receive Public Hearing notices at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a> .  During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.
1037	4/20/2023	Jose M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option of segment B please	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1038	2/19/2023	Jose Ortiz	Online	380 in Prosper should not be expanded. A new road north of Prosper should be built to accommodate the increasing traffic. By changing the current road you impact so many neighborhoods that are built up close to 380. All of your analysis just looks at where the road would be not the surrounding homes which is very short sighted. The expansion needs to go North so it doesn't disrupt as many current home owners and businesses.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
1039	3/7/2023	Jose Tronchoni	Email	NO to Segment A. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruptions to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Jose Tronchoni	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1040	2/6/2023	Joseph / Mary Borchard	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D?</p> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1041	4/20/2023	Joseph A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please consider the economic impacts of your decision.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1042	2/22/2023	Joseph Fields	Online (2)	I do not support this roadway option B as mapped through Prosper.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.
1043	2/17/2023	Joseph Gebbia	Online	Two years ago TXDOT was in support of segment D... Now all the sudden they have switched to C. Its not right that TXDOT should be able to take peoples land supposedly for the good of a few. Segment D effects a handful of people and segment C effects 100s of people and animals. Maybe not directly but the road is right in there front yard.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT's Recommended Alignment, which included a conceptual Segment D section, was based on the data collected during the Feasibility Study. Throughout the subsequent NEPA process, TxDOT has gathered more detailed information and continued work with stakeholders.  It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.
1044	3/7/2023	Joseph Huffman	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1045	3/16/2023	Joseph Lawrence	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1046	4/20/2023	Joseph M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1047	2/17/2023	Joseph Miller	Online	How was the segment matrix analysis weighted in comparing Segment A and Segment B? Segment B cost less than Segment A and if I remember correctly from a previous version of this presentation Segment B is safer than Segment A in terms of future predicted accidents and fatalities. Also, why was this important safety information omitted from this current version of the presentation? Or did I miss it? Segment B would potentially displace 0 businesses versus 15 businesses displaced by Segment A. The other evaluation categories seemed comparable between Segments A and B. I do not understand how you could select Segment A given the evaluation criteria cited. Also, if Segment A is ultimately approved additional noise barrier walls should be built to dampen the noise on the Tucker Hill side. Thank you. Sincerely, Joseph Miller	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.  TxDOT provides a summary of fatal and injury crashes by alternative in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .  TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.
1048	4/20/2023	Joseph P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1049	4/20/2023	Joseph R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A yes to b if you feel the need to spend money with a third rate bandaid	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1050	2/14/2023	Joseph R. Sain	Email	<p>RE: TxDot – DEIS Preferred Alternative Segment A</p> <p>The Greenspoint of Prosper Homeowners Association wholeheartedly endorses the recommendations of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (“DEIS”) in finding SEGMENT A to be the Preferred Alternative concerning Highway 380. Greenspoint of Prosper is a small neighborhood of 91 homes/families located along the west side of Prosper Town Lake and adjacent Town Lake Park. Numerous species of birds, fish, turtles, along with many other indigenous animal species of North Texas find sanctuary in this beautiful natural environment that many residents of Prosper and other communities regularly enjoy.</p> <p>Our support is based, in part, of the fact that the Segment A alignment would result in the least amount of environmental damage to Town Lake and Town Lake Park. Additionally, there are many other valuable resources (both existing and those currently under development and/or construction) that are used and will be used by residents of Greenspoint of Prosper that will be preserved as a result of finding SEGMENT A the Preferred Alternative; including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rutherford Park, a long-time planned park which serves as an extension of the Town of Prosper’s well-laid master park plan and trail system.</li> <li>2. The PISD Educational Systems’ plan for a "Robust and Accessible" Science and Learning Center.</li> <li>3. Mane Gait Therapeutic Rehabilitation Horse Center.</li> <li>4. Ladera of Prosper, which serves the Northwest Collin County region as a dedicated Over 55 Neighborhood.</li> <li>5. Founders Academy Charter School.</li> <li>6. Rutherford Creek housing development.</li> <li>7. Malabar Hills Residential Community.</li> <li>8. Walnut Grove High School.</li> </ol> <p>We are fully supportive of the EIS Studies, Engineering Studies, and all additional materials reviewed that have yielded this conclusion and truly believe it is by far the best possible alternative.</p> <p>Kindest regards, Joseph R. Sain - Greenspoint of Prosper HOA President</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.</p> <p>It is not necessary for TxDOT to make a determination regarding whether use of Wandering Creek Park and Ladera Park would or would not be in compliance with Section 4(f) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)’s implementing regulations at 23 CFR Part 744 because the preferred Blue Alternative does not use either of those parks. As explained in Section 3.9 of the FEIS, the Blue Alternative would require right-of-way from Rutherford Park; however, that would be the case with respect to any of the reasonable alternatives evaluated in the FEIS. TxDOT will evaluate Rutherford Park under Section 4(f).</p>
1051	3/16/2023	Joseph Thill	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1052	3/15/2023	Josh Allen	Email	Mr. Endres, I wanted to shoot over my response to the US 380 EIS project. I am a Prosper resident and am against any bypass through the Town of Prosper. This would disrupt schools and the Main Gate horse therapy operation. I prefer the current proposed 380 alignment. Josh Allen Senior Vice President, Sales 972-824-5719   [REDACTED]	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1053	4/20/2023	Josh W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A- As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1054	4/20/2023	Joshua C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Our family will be forced to move out of a neighborhood that we love if this passes.	Your comment is noted.
1055	3/30/2023	Joshua Roberts	Online	As a 6yr resident of McKinney, choosing to reside southeast of US380 and Custer Rd, I am writing to share my voice in support of Segment B - the segment which will A) require less development cost while also B) impacting fewer residents and businesses currently within McKinney city limits... less \$, less negative impact. This should be all that is required to make a commonsense decision without consideration for the noise, pollution, and negative impact that Segment A will further threaten all those, such as my family, who currently utilize the entrance of Stonebridge Dr to access US380. I chose to live within McKinney and found that US380 provides my family good access to cross my city on an as needed basis. Similarly, those who choose to cross East to West who do not wish to enter McKinney at all would be best served to "bypass" as much of the current city path as possible. As such, Segment B is the only Segment which makes sense for current residents and anticipated future travelers.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.  Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1056	3/16/2023	Joy and Ernest Townsend	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I have sent previous e-mails to you and the state; as well as signing petitions. In the time interval, the only action that I have seen is further build-up along 380, especially west of Custer. This is in addition to new subdivisions in that area. As a tax payer and citizen of Texas, I do NOT understand why this has been allowed to occur. That land was unoccupied and much more conducive to new highway construction. It would also have been much cheaper! Please explain why the State of Texas would choose a more expensive and destructive option A, instead of Option B? Sincerely, Joy and Ernest Townsend	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. TxDOT does not have jurisdiction to halt the progress of developments being built until after the FEIS/ROD has been approved.</p>
1057	3/16/2023	Joy Bradford	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1058	2/26/2023	Joyce A. and William S. Yackinous	Email	<p>This message is from Joyce A. Yackinous and William S. Yackinous. As homeowners and citizens of McKinney, TX., we strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B. We say no to Segment A and yes to Segment B.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1059	2/6/2023	Joyce Castle	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1060	4/20/2023	Joyce H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I support Project 380 Segment B and strongly oppose Project 380 Segment A of the "Blue Alternative". In addition, I vehemently oppose the Segment A \"shift\", which would bring the 12-lane freeway and its elevated ramps and overpasses even closer to Stonebridge\'s Kensington Village residents, while sending eastbound Highway 380 drivers speeding toward Freedom Drive and shining headlights into our windows. As for the 2050 projected noise level assessed at 1:00 pm, it is preposterous and absolutely insulting to state that homeowners would be non-impacted by the noise of an elevated freeway so close to their homes (and the Segment A \"shift\" noise level would be even higher). The noise and pollution would make living in our homes unbearable. In addition, Segment B is the vastly less expensive option, while disrupting fewer homes and businesses.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1061	2/25/2023	Joyce Sakai	Email	Mr. Endres- As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Joyce Sakai	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1062	4/20/2023	Judi G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1063	2/25/2023	Judi Gregory	Email	Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B Thank you, Judi Gregory Wyndsor Grove/The Heritage Community	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1064	4/20/2023	Judith B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and a citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I live in the Wren Creek neighborhood of Stonebridge Ranch which partly borders on US 380. The increased noise and pollution from the proposed Segment A will not only adversely affect our quality of life but will also surely adversely affect the value of our property.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1065	4/20/2023	Judith S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am retired. This put a highway in between me and my family and my doctors. I don't understand why they put a segment through existing neighborhoods when there is a section just north that goes through mostly undeveloped areas. Option A makes no sense and impacts more people that option B	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1066	3/30/2023	Judy A	Online	<p>Strong opposition to proposed expansion of Highway 380 near Bloomridge, community where I live. Mother of autistic toddler, especially concerned about the risks &amp; disruptions this will cause to our community, its negative impacts on our quality of life, health, every day activities &amp; home values. Segment A will wrap around Bloomridge in close proximity to our homes impacting two entrances &amp; putting our families at risk. The resulting noise &amp; air pollution will be devastating &amp; detrimental to my child's health &amp; wellbeing, our mental peace from all the noise since Bloomridge didnt exist therefore exclude in the study. This project will decrease our home values, force us to bear higher tax burden without any corresponding benefit. I urge you to reconsider this plan &amp; instead look for more suitable alternatives that do not require disrupting residences. Reassess noise impacts, add noise barriers to the plans to alleviate the impacts &amp; chaos from the huge highway coming at our doorsteps.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 TIP. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the traffic noise analysis t can be found in the DEIS in Section 3.14.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)–approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Bloomridge subdivision does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements for a noise barrier. Landscaping is generally coordinated with cities in future phases of a project.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
1067	2/24/2023	Judy Buerkle	Email	<p>No to Segment A, YES to Segment B. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	
1068	4/20/2023	Judy C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Definitely I prefer option B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1069	4/20/2023	Judy S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Yes to B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1070	2/22/2023	Judy Slease	Online	I would like to see the bypass come back to 380 closer to Preston or the Tollway. It makes sense that if someone is using it they might want to join the Tollway as an alternative to driving on 380 to Denton. This would also protect more of the Stonebridge Ranch properties.	Your comment is noted. There are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
1071	3/30/2023	Judy Strawmyer	Online	The problem that McKinney created is McKinney's problem to deal with. Prosper is Prosper and there is no reason for the town of Prosper to bear this problem for the lack of McKinney planning. Established Prosper is 'established'. Main Gate is integral to the life of so many people and has been in place for a long time. Prosper has made wise use of it's limited land. Please use logical land use supporting Prosper. Use the unused land for McKinney's traffic problem. If there is a reason to 'take' land for a bypass, take the land from McKinney.	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
1072	4/20/2023	Judy W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A; Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1073	3/24/2023	Julia Poempipatana	Email	<p>Senator Paxton, Representative Leach, and Mr. Endres: I strongly oppose Segment C and support Segment D. My name is Julia Poempipatana. I am the founder and CEO of Waldessori Schoolhouse, a nonprofit hybrid school for families who homeschool on New Hope Road. We have been open for 2 years. We have 50 families now and will have 75 by the fall from all over mckinney and surrounding cities who send us their children. We provide a unique blend of educational resources- waldorf, montessori, and nature based studies for 3 yr olds to 12 yr olds. We just rented our 2nd building on this road because the demand for alternative education and help in the homeschooling journey is so high. If segment C goes through, our schools will have to shut down because access to new hope road will be re routed and many will not be able to access us without adding significantly to their commute. Furthermore, our partner up the road, Mr T.R., owner of wedding pearls venue, will have to shut down his lifelong dream of having an event center. Segment C will run right through his property. If it were not for his generosity we would not even have a school. He allows us to host biannual fundraisers on his 12 acre historic farm to raise money to upkeep our our school grounds and purchase needed materials. Please help us do everything that you can to push along segment D instead of C! It would mean the world to me as well as many many other children and families. Sincerely, Julia Poempipatana 214-718-0732</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. Based on the address of the school location, access is still available using local FM roads and the proposed frontage roads connecting to the FM roads.</p> <p>The current proposed design of Segment C would impact the wedding pearls venue property. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser.</p>
1074	1/18/2023	Julia Poempipatana	Email	<p>As a homeowner in Melissa Texas at 3205 berry hollow Drive, I urge you to consider abandoning the proposal for segment C and instead utilize the proposed segment D expansion for Highway 380. Segment D will displace fewer residents, disrupt fewer farms, and come in contact with fewer hazardous material sites. Sincerely, Julia Poempipatana 214-718-0732</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>
1075	4/20/2023	Julie B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Please do not destroy our community with the Segment A plan. Please implement the Segment B plan.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1076	4/20/2023	Julie B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A and yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1077	4/2/2023	Julie Clark	Email	<p>Hello Mr. Endres,  I am a resident of Prosper in Whitley Place and am living here with my husband and 5 children. We love the area we live in for so many reasons. I want to voice my support, again, for Route A. I am sure you are well versed in all of the reasons why this would be the ideal route. First I would like to quote TXDOT's own EIS report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It would require the least amount of now right of way.</li> <li>2) It would not displace any community facilities (Such as ManeGait, an organization of the utmost importance to the Collin county community which would unduly be impacted by the alternate B route)</li> <li>3) Results in the least number of noise receptors with substantial noise level increases</li> <li>4) Be the least impactful on flood plains and regulatory floodways</li> <li>5 )Minimize the conversion of farmland</li> <li>6) Meet the project Purpose and Need.</li> </ol> <p>Additionally, Prosper has continued to develop as a master planned community with the idea that US380 would be a freeway, changing the route to cut through a significant portion of Prosper would disproportionately affect the Town of Prosper's commercial real estate, and new developments which support its tax base. This would in turn have other down stream effects on Town parks, schools, students, teachers, and residents. I implore you to make a final decision regarding this bypass and stick with the blue route as recommended by TXDOT's own EIS study. Continued delay and discussion has significantly and negatively affected the Collin County community. Thanks so much,  Julie Clark</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1078	4/20/2023	Julie E	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A.....Please	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1079	3/12/2023	Julie Gestes	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.  Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1080	3/7/2023	Julie Salcido	Email	I am a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for your time Julie Salcido	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1081	3/7/2023	Julie Smith	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1082	3/28/2023	Junaid Ahmed	Email	Hello Mr. Endres: As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you! Sincerely, Junaid Ahmed Stonebridge Ranch Resident McKinney, TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1083	4/20/2023	June Poe	Online	I am a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer. I strongly object to TXDOT's recommendation of segment A over segment B: This is fiscal irresponsibility. It is wrong to give more consideration to developers than to existing residents. Segment A would be very detrimental to my everyday life because there will be noise and pollution so very close to two sides of my home. I'm retired and currently enjoy enjoy a quiet life here, interacting with neighbors in our front porch community.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1084	2/25/2023	Jurgen Lison	Online	A support the TxDot A-E-C recommendation - and strongly urge all groups to align on this proposal and expeditiously move forward with the implementation. Further debates will only delay the schedule, causing more and more negative effect on McKinney and surrounding businesses.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1085	4/20/2023	Justin C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This is not the best route. I work in the commercial real estate industry (software and data solutions) and know who owns every single parcel in the USA including those whose ownership is disguised by LLC\'s and other types of entities to hide the true owner. I know who has influence and why certain routes or other segments were not chosen. Its clear that influential developers and political donors have much more to say then regular, everyday people, living in local neighborhoods. It\'s a joke and sad.	Your comment is noted.
1086	3/24/2023	Justin Collins	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I also have access to software that allows me to identify the owner of every single parcel in the United States. Please share why developing this 380 bypass through Prosper, who has a much small population, much more vacant land (especially north of 380 on Custer, and impacts many less homes and businesses, is not the recommended path?? Does it have anything to do with influential developers who stand to profit much more in future private land sales then "fair market" value today? It's sad to see... it's the reality of political influence. Do the right thing....</p> <p>J Collins</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Regarding future developments, there are both residential and commercial developments under construction and being planned along Segments A and B. Those that TxDOT was made aware of prior to the Public Hearing are shown on the Segment Analysis Matrix with their development status and the development heat map exhibit available on the Public Hearing website. Many future homes that are currently under construction in the Ladera residential development would have been directly impacted by Segment B. Due to the rapidly changing nature of developments as they go through local planning processes, TxDOT only classified a development as future displacements if the development is expected to be occupied by the anticipated ROD date.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1087	3/16/2023	Justin Rura	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1088	4/20/2023	Justin W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	A is a terrible option for homes, developments and businesses located in its path. Access to homes/ developments as well as noise and property values will suffer. It is irresponsible use of taxpayer monies to approve option A, which to my understanding will cost \$90-100 Million MORE than option B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1089	3/14/2023	Justin Wheeler	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Justin Wheeler	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1090	4/20/2023	Jutta W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I opt for plan B of the proposals.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1091	2/6/2023	JV and Son's Upholstery	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1092	2/21/2023	JW Bandy	Email	<p>Dear Sir,  I understand that you and those in charge at TxDot feel the need to create relief on 380. However, putting people out of their homes, land, and businesses is NEVER the answer. It is unfortunate that the powers that be were and are continuously are so short sighted. Cities expand, that's a given. Thoughts about expansion should have been thought of 50-20 years ago. At that time, city leaders should have purchased land for things like this. They did not. Their lack of planning does not give you the right to steal land from tax payers. Yes, offering a pittance of cash for homes, land, and businesses IS stealing. Easing traffic is not a valid reason to use eminent domain. If you want to use private property to expand the road, you should start with your own private property. The citizens of Collin and Denton county should not be punished for the short sightedness of others. Do the right thing and do NOT steal land from others for your project. A reply to this email would be appreciated. Preferably with an alternative that is acceptable to ALL residents.  JW Bandy</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. Additional traffic has increased as the community grows and develops over time. Therefore, there is a need to improve the mobility within the region.</p> <p>TxDOT evaluated many different alignments during the feasibility study completed in 2020. Based on that study, TxDOT evaluated the most feasible alternatives during the EIS process. All alignments studied would require TxDOT to have impact property owners to some degree.</p> <p>Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services. TxDOT must obtain an independent third-party appraisal to determine the fair market value. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Section 3.1, as well as figures 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 of the DEIS provide additional information about right-of-way acquisition and displacements.</p>
1093	3/16/2023	Jyolsna Joy Thomas	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A  March 16, 2023  As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1094	2/24/2023	K B	Online	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B  As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1095	3/29/2023	K L	Online	I prefer 380 stay on 380 and the Outer Loop to be expedited. However if that's not possible then I support the Blue Line option (A, E, C route.).	<p>Your comment is noted. The Green Alternative, or Segment F, from Coit Road to FM 1827 (also referred to as "keeping 380 on 380" or expanding the existing US 380 to a freeway), was identified during the Feasibility Study, but ultimately was not carried forward for further analysis after because it would have displaced more than 30 residents and 200 businesses including Raytheon.</p> <p>The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.</p>
1096	2/22/2023	Kacey J	Online	Please keep 380 on 380 and don't encroach on properties that never intended to be near 380. Folks who are already on 380 knew what they were getting into when they moved there. Others purposefully bought properties away from that highway and do not want 380 brought to their doorstep!	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
1097	3/28/2023	Kaela Stambor	Email	<p>NO to Segment A</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Sincerely,Kaela</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1098	4/19/2023	Kaitlin Anderson	Email	<p>Hello - My name is Kaitlin Anderson and I live in Tucker Hill. I'm very concerned about the proposed route of the 380 expansion/bypass. Tucker Hill is a front porch community by design and given the amount of time spent outside and in our community, I am concerned about air quality and noise and do not feel they were adequately addressed nor were our facilities and neighborhood type properly identified in the study. We moved to this area and neighborhood so our children (now 11 and 9) could play outside, meet friends, and stay active. So far they have thrived and been able to do so happily and safely. Have you done an accurate study on the noise pollution we will be subject to? Have you assessed how much cut through traffic will go through Tucker Hill? I want what's best for our whole community and I'd like to feel comfortable that you do to. Thank you, Kaitlin Anderson Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. TxDOT does not foresee cut through traffic through Tucker Hill because the only connections are available via Tremont Road and Grassmere Road from US 380.
1099	4/20/2023	Kaitlin H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Option A. Option A is much more disruptive to existing infrastructure. Please consider option B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1100	3/15/2023	Kaitlyn Stroud	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, I would like to voice my support, for Route A. I am sure you are well versed in all of the reasons why this would be the ideal route. First I would like to quote TXDOT's own EIS report. 1) It would require the least amount of now right of way. 2) It would not displace any community facilities (Such as ManeGait, an organization of the utmost importance to the Collin county community which would unduly be impact by the alternate B route) 3) Results in the least number of noise receptors with substantial noise level increases 4) Be the least impactful on flood plains and regulatory floodways 5 )Minimize the conversion of farmland 6) Meet the project Purpose and Need. Additionally, Prosper has continued to develop as a master planned community with the idea that US380 would be a freeway, changing the route to cut through a significant portion of Prosper would disproportionately affect the Town of Prosper's commercial real estate, and new developments which support its tax base. This would in turn have other down stream effects on Town parks, schools, students, teachers, and residents. I implore you to make a final decision regarding this bypass and stick with the blue route as recommended by TXDOT's own EIS study. Continued delay and discussion has significantly and negatively affected the Collin County community. Thank you, Kaitlyn Stroud</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1101	2/25/2023	Kalen Sawyer	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1102	4/3/2023	Kalene and Maurice Sherffius	Email	<p>To introduce myself, my name is Kalene Sherffius and I live at 6008 Bellflower Dr. with my husband Maurice Sherffius. We bought our new home in the Bloomridge Subdivision in May, 2019. There are two entrances along Bloomdale Rd &amp; Ridge Rd. When we bought our home there was no mention of an eight lane freeway running along Bloomdale Rd but later that summer Mayor George Fuller had a town hall meeting concerning the 380 Bypass. People from Heatherwood, Robinson Ridge &amp; Bloomridge were in attendance. George Fuller informed us then if he gets his way there would be an eight lane freeway on Bloomdale Rd. I voiced my concerns then regarding allowing developers to put in these submissions? Fuller arrogantly informed me a developer has a constitutional right to develop. Needless to say he had to walk that remark back. Currently, there is a subdivision going in north and west of Ridge &amp; Bloomdale I am beginning to believe that most politicians believe they can do anything they want to and this 380 Bypass is an excellent example. If I had been asked I would have advocated and still do for an overpass to extend from Coit to just east of McDonald. Omaha NE had the same issue on Dodge St, (Hwy 6) with business running along on both sides of the road. This overpass connects into several Interstate exchanges and works very well with the least amount of disruption. We have attended all the open houses and have not received information on what will happen on Ridge Rd, north of Wilmeth Rd and Bloomdale Rd, west of Ridge Rd. I would like to know as these two roads are country roads and right now they are very busy with traffic circumventing 380 traffic. These roads are full of potholes, uneven road bed with no shoulders. I have heard the preferred route would go through Tucker Hill and that would be a travesty. This 380 Bypass needs to be pushed further north and possibly tie into I-35 somehow. I'm not an engineer to know if this would be a possibility but the options that have been presented are impacting peoples lives and standard of living because City and County elected officials let developers build new subdivisions without any care or concern about the people who would be buying these homes. I would appreciate some feedback on my concerns as the people at the open houses did not seem to have any answers. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Kalene &amp; Maurice Sherffius 6008 Bellflower Dr 214-605-7993 Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. TxDOT has been coordinating with multiple developers in the area you mention and City of McKinney to best accommodate the project and future development.</p> <p>Regarding your reference to an overpass from Coit Road to McDonald Street, double decked (or elevated) freeway sections were considered during the Feasibility Study. It will not be further considered for the corridor because it would not substantially reduce the amount of right-of-way needed to construct the roadway, and it would be more expensive. It's important to note that TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove elevated freeways in several locations across the state, including I-35 in downtown Austin.</p> <p>TxDOT has been working with City of McKinney staff to coordinate this US 380 project with future city roadway plans for Ridge Road and Bloomdale Road. Maintenance of these roadways is the responsibility of local governments.</p> <p>Our analysis found that even if all the planned roadways in Collin County are built or improved as planned (Ridge Road and Bloomdale Road included), US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both a US 380 freeway and the Collin County Outer Loop are needed to relieve congestion. You can find more out about future City of McKinney plans at <a href="https://www.mckinneytexas.org/244/Engineering">https://www.mckinneytexas.org/244/Engineering</a>. Our team encourages you to take a look at the arterial master plan linked on this page.</p> <p>It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p>
1103	3/28/2023	Kara Martin	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Kara Martin</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1104	4/20/2023	Karen A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Don't ruin McKinney with plan A; please use plan B! I'm so thankful we moved from CA to McKinney, TX 2 years ago. I call it "heaven on earth". Please don't change it! I've lived 'that way' already.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.
1105	4/20/2023	Karen B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	STRONGLY APPOSE SEG A YES TO SEGMENT B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1106	4/20/2023	Karen D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A is more expensive and disrupts more homes and businesses. Some of these impacted businesses are currently under construction. Segment A is also much more expensive. I believe there are also more environmental concerns. Please choose section B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1107	3/10/2023	Karen Denton	Online	We have lived just south of 380 and slightly west of Ridge for 8 years. We worked hard to pick a neighborhood that was close enough to enjoy access to familiar places we were comfortable with (moved from north Plano), but where we could enjoy the uniqueness of McKinney. We specifically chose the far north end of the city so we could live in relative peace and quiet and enjoy seeing the beautiful Texas stars each night. Our particular lot was specifically chosen only after verifying that nothing could ever be built directly across the street from our part of the street. That land is owned by the neighborhood and is a dog park. We understand McKinney is growing. We enjoy much of the new growth around us. The traffic on 380 isn't sustainable in the current state, but of all of the plans to improve or bypass it, this particular plan makes the least sense. It displaces many more homes and businesses. Manegate will likely still need to relocate because of noise. Find another way.	Your comment is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.  Based on the Preferred Alternative including Segment A, which runs along the existing US 380, Manegait representatives have not indicated that they would relocate because of noise.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1108	3/6/2023	Karen Falk	Email	<p>Stephen Public Hearing Comment Form 2751 Majestic Avenue McKinney, TX. 75071</p> <p>I have lived next to a 8+ lane interstate highway and the noise from it was noticeable and did impact your property values. TXDOT needs to provide berms, trees, sound wall etc. to min. noise regardless of what your specialists say. I would also like to see how you are going to stay on budget for this project. I suspect you will go over 30-50% budget. Why doesn't TXDOT also include a bike and running path in its plans for north Texas residents. I thought the state of Texas was more fiscally responsible when a less costly option is available.</p>	<p>The next phase of project development will include developing the final design and starting the process for right-of-way acquisition and coordination with utilities. These tasks will enable TxDOT to refine its cost estimates.</p> <p>Implementation of the Blue Alternative would comply with TxDOT's Bicycle Accommodation Design Guidance, which also implements the USDOT's and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)'s policies regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. Shared Use Paths (SUPs) built along the outside of the frontage roads would link to existing sidewalk systems and the components of McKinney's City-Wide Trail Master Plan and Prosper's Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan and Hike &amp; Bike Trail Master Plan as they are implemented. The design of the SUPs would comply with TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, guidelines developed by AASHTO, and with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Providing SUPs with connectivity to existing and planned bicycle and pedestrian systems would comply with the USDOT's policy to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into transportation systems. The SUPs would also support multi-modal use of the corridor for those residents that do not have access to a vehicle. More information about Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities can be found in Section 3.5 of the EIS.</p>
1109	4/20/2023	Karen G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1110	2/25/2023	Karen Gallagher-Nguyen	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,            With great respect, I ask that you consider my comments below regarding the 380 bypass.            As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.            Reasons to consider OPPOSING Segment A:            Costs taxpayers \$98.8 million more            Impacts 57% more natural wetlands &amp; wildlife            Negatively impacts Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods            Reasons to SUPPORT Segment B:            Requires 73% fewer business and residential displacements            Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at U.S. 380 &amp; Custer Road            14% shorter, saving time and money            Thank you for your consideration,            Karen Gallagher-Nguyen</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1111	2/16/2023	Karen Smith	Paper form	<p>I have put my life's savings into building Tara Royal Equestrian on 2933. I house the McKinney Mounted Patrol and 45 other clients who drive to my facility from many other cities and they bring business to our city. The noise and chaos resulting from the traffic would destroy what I have built and owner for 10 years now. I will have to close my sanctuary as the bypass will destroy our atmosphere. I oppose C! Please put it back on Woodlawn or D.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. Construction of the Preferred Alternative would not require TxDOT to acquire any of the Tara Royal Equestrian property. For additional information on our study of horsemanship facilities, please see pages 206 and 207 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1112	3/9/2023	Karen Smith	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,                      On TXDOT's route "C" I am dot #1442. What you have not considered is behind that dot is a 66 year old woman who worked her entire life to save up to built her dream. I purchased 64 acre in McKinney's ETJ ten years ago, invested in excess of \$3,000,000 and built it into one of the most stunning equestrian centers in north Texas (see for yourself at <a href="https://nam11.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.tararoyal.com%2F&amp;data=05%7C01%7Cstephen.endres%40txdot.gov%7C5b0a9e9369b246dd94b708db210926e5%7C39dba4765c094c6391dace7a3ab5224d%7C0%7C0%7C638140095407806768%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=06vszBL%2B06auk69BOD7YnMa80jx%2BODssENo%2F9U%2BxCuQ%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://nam11.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.tararoyal.com%2F&amp;data=05%7C01%7Cstephen.endres%40txdot.gov%7C5b0a9e9369b246dd94b708db210926e5%7C39dba4765c094c6391dace7a3ab5224d%7C0%7C0%7C638140095407806768%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=06vszBL%2B06auk69BOD7YnMa80jx%2BODssENo%2F9U%2BxCuQ%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>). I employ 5 workers while caring for 48 horses and 44 clients who come from all over the metroplex to ride in this tranquil peace of country. I have been home to the McKinney mounted police patrol horses for 9 years and have cared for the horses of Jerry Jones (Dallas Cowboys) to name just a few. Route C will destroy my business as the noise level &amp; carbon emissions associated with an 8 lane highway are prohibitive to the health &amp; safety of the horses &amp; riders. I am pleading with you to return to Route D which affects the lives of almost none. When I met you at an open house you told me it is merely a financial decision but you are not considering that they will destroy 29 ranch estates (most of which are retirement estates) and 15 businesses. You have also not considered the massive amount of money that you will lose in lawsuits as many of these people have already retained attorneys. Please be our hero by standing up for us and make the right decision for the people &amp; businesses that will be wiped out from a highway along route C.</p> <p>I appreciate your consideration,                      Karen Smith                      Tara Royal Equestrian                      (469) 855-0700</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Construction of the Preferred Alternative would not require TxDOT to acquire any of the Tara Royal Equestrian property. For additional information on our study of horsemanship facilities, please see pages 206 and 207 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1113	2/6/2023	Karen Whittington / Allison Baggaly	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1114	3/16/2023	Kari Hansen	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1115	2/17/2023	Karla Degollado	Online	I consider Segment C is going to be a catastrophe segment since is going to destroy a wildlife and nature, when we move to our house we considered the city was going to grow toward us but this way. Considering traffic and not a peaceful environment for our family. We Support Segment D considering this would save forests and woodlands. GO SEGMENT D!!!	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1116	2/26/2023	Karrie Bernecker	Email	Dear Mr Endres, I am writing in support of the choice for using the BLUE Alternative as the preferred design for the expansion of the 380 corridor. This choice will be the least disruptive to many schools and neighborhoods. Also, the Blue Alternative saves Maingait, which is an important part of the Prosper community. Thank you for listening to our concerns. Very Respectfully, Kerrie Bernecker 3460 Newport Dr Prosper TX 75078	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1117	2/25/2023	Karthik Srivatsa	Email	Mr. Endres, With great respect, I ask that you consider my comments below regarding the 380 bypass. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Reasons to consider OPPOSING Segment A: Costs taxpayers \$98.8 million more Impacts 57% more natural wetlands & wildlife Negatively impacts Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods Reasons to SUPPORT Segment B: Requires 73% fewer business and residential displacements Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at U.S. 380 & Custer Road 14% shorter, saving time and money Thank you for your consideration, Regards, Karthik Srivatsa	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				6329, Falcon Ridge Ln, McKinney TX 75071	
1118	2/21/2023	Kate Casper	Online	Hello Mr Endres, I would like to voice my support on the proposed expansion of HWY380 segments A-E-C. I am especially in support of the decision to to remove Segment B from consideration. Thank you for listening to the citizens of Prosper as this would have been devastating for our small community. Again thank you for the removal of segment B from the proposed expansion. Kate Casper	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1119	4/20/2023	Kate H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1120	2/26/2023	Kate Huthmaker	Email	Hi Stephen, If you are still considering input, my vote is NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Segment A would very negatively impact the area where I live. Thanks for your consideration. Kate Huthmaker	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1121	3/30/2023	Katelyn Bogenschutz	Online	I live at 6020 Aster drive. The projected freeway plans would place it directly behind my lot, elevated looking down into my backyard. I think it goes without saying that this would greatly decrease my home value as well as our comfort and safety living here. The freeway being so close to our home will bring significant noise, emissions, as well as an increase of cars speeding on and off the frontage road directly behind our home. We bought this home because it was tucked away in a quiet part of town surrounded by farms and fields. I'm so heartbroken that after only a couple years, we will instead be surrounded by such a large freeway (not to mention the years of construction noise/hassle leading up to it). Please reconsider the placement of this project. If it were even just one street further north it would effect far less people and neighborhoods.	Your comment and opposition of the Preferred Alternative is noted. Based on the design presented at the Public Hearing, is not proposed on elevated structure. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.  It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1122	3/10/2023	Katey Wright	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Katey Wright	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1123	4/20/2023	Katharine T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to plan A and yes to plan B Plan B is less disruptive, less costly and just makes sense.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1124	3/15/2023	Kathleen and Jim Bostick	Email	Dear Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Kathleen & Jim Bostick 1401 Silverlake Road McKinney, TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1125	2/20/2023	Kathleen Crocker	Email	Dear Sirs, I cannot believe that you would chose to destroy one of the few truly natural sanctuaries we have in McKinney! The work being done in that place cannot be measured in almighty \$\$\$\$. Please do not destroy this haven; we do not want Route C to be chosen!!! I am begging of you. Kathleen Crocker 3075 Willow Grove Blvd #2602 McKinney, TX 75070	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1126	2/23/2023	Kathleen Elberson	Email	Mr. Endres, I am writing in opposition to the planned 380 bypass designated plan "C." Plan C will impact far more landowners and the impact on the environment will be far worse. Plan D impacts only 7 residences and 4 business as opposed to the 29 residences and 15 businesses impacted by plan C. Plan C has far more environmental impact as it would have disastrous consequences for the last remaining forests and wetlands in Collin County. Plan C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife and I feel strongly that they should be heeded as they seek to protect the precious natural resources of Texas. Progress at the cost of the environment and the people of the county and state is no real progress at all. Especially when a viable and far less disruptive option is available. Sincerely, Kathleen Elberson	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
1127	4/20/2023	Kathleen G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No, to segment A. Yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1128	4/20/2023	Kathleene D L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please consider the health & safety of all Tucker Hill residents who have invested so much time & money into their homes and selected this neighborhood as a quiet, beautiful place to reside.	Your comment is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.
1129	2/23/2023	Kathryn Harrison	Comment Form	<p>I strongly oppose C (Catastrophe) and support D (Decent) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- C divides residential and farming/ranching communities!</li> <li>- C affects and displaces more residences, businesses and community resources</li> <li>- C damages a large forest in Collin County</li> <li>- C was strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife</li> </ul> <p>My church life group is hosted by a family whose house will be destroyed! The have tons of horses, cows and dogs that will be displaced. THIS IS WRONG!</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory roadway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
1130	2/17/2023	Kathryn Shinn	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:                      1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.                      2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.                      3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.                      4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.                      5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.                      6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.                      7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.                      Thank you,                      Kathryn Shunn</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1131	4/20/2023	Kathryn W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I moved to Tucker Hill 4 years ago for its quaint charm and quiet community. In the past 4 years, almost every patch of green has been built up into housing and strip malls. Now they are talking about putting a 12 lane hwy right next to our homes. Our property values will plummet, our peace and quiet will disappear and will literally take away all the reasons I moved here in the first place. Also, I do not understand why the plan that has this hwy going through Tucker Hill will cost double of the other plan. Isn't it a no brainer?	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1132	4/17/2023	Kathryn Webb	Email	Hello - I am writing you to beg that you do not build a 380 bypass as proposed in segment A. Here are my reasons for asking you to consider option B: 1) B is less money 2) B is a shorter distance and time to construct. 3) B has less home and business impact. On a personal note, I moved from California to Texas 5 years looking for a quieter and more peaceful life. I found Tucker Hill. My home in CA was about the same distance from a 8 line hwy as the one you are proposing in option A. The pollution, air quality, noise, trash and water crime were all higher because of it. Again the reason I moved. I took all the money I had to buy my house in Tucker Hill and now I'm being threatened by this monstrosity being built in my backyard. I feel I will have no other option than to move which saddens me because I love everything about my community. If option A passes and I sell, I will almost assuredly lose money because this will ruin our home values. I don't imagine we will be made while by this financial loss. Thank you for your consideration and I pray that you make the decision to go with option B. Sincerely, Kathryn Webb	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1133	3/21/2023	Kathy Kier	Email	This project was brought to my attention and I am respectfully writing to you in the hope that you end up electing Route D instead of Route C. Although I live south of the contested area, I am commenting as a concerned citizen. The disruptive intrusiveness of Route C makes no sense when we have an alternative with Route D. Asking the question "Why?" I'd like to know the reason for supporting Route C. In my opinion, Route C makes no sense unless one plans to benefit financially by this scheme. That may or may not be you directly, but it might enrich friends. Perhaps some research is needed to bring everything to light. In the meantime, count this email as a big NO to Route C. And if you must create a bypass, please choose one that is more in line with the people and their environment...Route D. Sincerely, Kathy Kier (469) 231-3513 [REDACTED]	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.  It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.
1134	4/20/2023	Kathy M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The current bypass destroys homeowners and is way too expensive	Your comment is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1135	4/20/2023	Kathy M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1136	3/14/2023	Kathy Morgan	Email	This plan costs more money and attacks the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge communities. This makes no sense whatsoever. Please reconsider plan A which does not put home ownership in peril. -- Kathy Morgan	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While the Preferred Alternative is adjacent to the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods, it does not cut through any existing subdivisions.
1137	2/16/2023	Kathy Seei	Paper form	As a homeowner in Whitley Place in Prosper I appreciate TxDOT listening to our concerns! I thoroughly researched future road plans before purchasing our home. I appreciate 380 not being diverted to south of our home.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1138	3/10/2023	Katie Alexander	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
1139	3/14/2023	Katie Jobe	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Katie Jobe Arbor Hollow Village Stonebridge Ranch	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1140	3/14/2023	Katie Kim	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you,</p> <p>Katie Kim Stonebridge Ranch resident</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1141	2/6/2023	Katlin Howard	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D?</p> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1142	3/13/2023	Katy Kaeding	Email	<p>Ms. Clemens, I would like to formally request an extension of the comments period, as we need more time to fully evaluate the impact and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill and the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. As a pediatric nurse and mother with four children, I am praying for the most safe and responsible outcome. Thank you, Katy Kaeding</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
1143	4/19/2023 4/20/2023	Katy Kaeding	Email (2)	<p>Mr. Endres, I have many questions based on numerous, numerous studies that I would like addressed, such as: · Have you (TxDOT) evaluated the FULL impact on air quality that this project would have – both during and after construction? What are the air quality measures being used – please explain them? · Has a study been done to evaluate the safety of the turns on Segment A relative to Segment B? · Why are future, hypothetical home and business owners along Segment B being given priority over us and other REAL (current/actual) home and business owners along Segment A??? · Please explain why in the world TxDot would choose a FAR MORE expensive option that effects FAR MORE ACTUAL PEOPLE (homeowners and businesses)? If it were far cheaper then I could at least understand the rationale, but to spend MORE money to adversely impact MORE people makes absolutely ZERO sense. Please explain. · How long is construction expected to last? · How will we get in and out of our neighborhood while our section of the highway is under construction? And more importantly, how will Emergency Response vehicles get in? Our 12 year old daughter has severe asthma and our 6 year old son was just taken in an ambulance to the ER in the past year. · Are there any other examples you can provide where an existing/established neighborhood with this many families (e.g., Tucker Hill) have been constricted on 2+ sides by a Highway expansion AND a</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. <i>Many of the responses to your comments are included in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary with the letter that was also attached. Responses below are those that are not included in Section A2.</i></p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>The conceptual timeline shared at the Public Hearing indicates that a Record of Decision for the EIS is anticipated to be issued in the fall of 2023. The next phase of project development is final design, ROW acquisition, and utilities coordination. This phase is estimated to take 2-4 years, putting the Ready to Let date sometime in 2027. Currently this project is not fully funded. Phased construction, which is expected to take three to four years, can only begin once full project funding is identified and secured for US 380. This anticipated timeline is subject to change</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>bypass running right up against the neighborhood (~900 feet away)???</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· What are the actual criteria being used for the decision on which Segment to pursue, and how are they being weighted for comparison?</li> <li>· How deeply recessed will 380 be in front of Tucker Hill? I've heard anywhere from 20-35 feet.</li> <li>· If you move forward with Segment A for the bypass, how will Air pollution be monitored and mitigated for Tucker Hill?</li> <li>· If you move forward with Segment A for the bypass, how will Noise pollution be monitored and mitigated for Tucker Hill?</li> <li>· How exactly can TxDot justify \$100+ MILLION more in Tax Payer expenses to pursue Segment A over Segment B? I've yet to hear any TRUE/RATIONAL justification. In fact, the justification I have seen (from the tireless/extensive research our neighbors have conducted) points toward Segment B being the better option for the bypass even without the SUBSTANTIAL cost differential. It simply makes NO SENSE to me whatsoever, and I'd like someone to explain it.</li> </ul> <p>There are REAL people's lives that are being undervalued by this decision, and it's simply not right. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Katy Kaeding, RN, BSN School Nurse St. Martin de Porres Catholic School [REDACTED] 469-362-2400</p> <p>And who will be answering my questions?</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>pending coordination, public involvement, technical analysis, and identification of funding.</p> <p>The freeway mainlanes remained depressed or below grade approximately 30 feet at Grassmere Lane.</p> <p>One of several examples of neighborhoods near freeways in North Texas is the Westhaven neighborhood directly adjacent to SH 121 in Coppell. SH 121 is to the south and east of the neighborhood. In many places, this neighborhood would actually be closer to the freeway frontage roads than what is being proposed near Tucker Hill and the future US 380. Another example is the Hackberry Creek neighborhood in Las Colinas that is bordered on three sides by IH 635, PGBT, and SH 114.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1144	4/20/2023	Kay Frank	Email	<p>Mr. Endres- As a McKinney homeowner, taxpayer and resident of Tucker Hill, I strongly encourage you to reconsider selecting segment A for the 380 bypass. I understand the need for future growth; however, TxDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents and will demonstrate significant fiscal irresponsibility. There were many inconsistencies and flaws in the conclusions reached by TxDOT and the underlying EIS. My friends and neighbors have expressed all my same concerns from the flawed and biased noise study to the inflated importance of therapeutic horses! It appears in your report that TxDOT is more concerned about horses than Reeves Elementary students! Reeves Elementary is a Title 1 School. This is a Federal designation based on the number of low-income students who are considered at-risk for school achievement and is part of the NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001. Was this ever considered when selecting segment A? These children who according to the Federal government are already at a disadvantage, are now going to be subjected to noise (sensory triggers), pollution, disruption in getting to school, etc. This is very personal to me as I have a child that is considered special needs and attends Reeves Elementary. I find the selection of Segment A very disheartening and it further supports my concerns about the lack of government fiscal and social responsibility. Kay Frank</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the potential effects on low-income and minority populations per Executive Order 12898.</p> <p>TxDOT, as an agent for the FHWA, is required to comply with ADA when providing access for persons with disabilities to its streets and sidewalks. Neither TxDOT nor Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), have ADA oversight responsibilities for projects outside of the public right-of-way that do not use federal surface transportation program funds. None of the reasonable alternatives would have required TxDOT to acquire property from ManeGait.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise levels were predicted out to 500 feet from the edge of proposed right-of-way. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. Reeves Elementary is a little less than a half mile away from the edge of proposed right-of-way for the project.</p> <p>Access to the school from Tucker Hill would still be maintained through the proposed US 380 frontage roads and existing US 380/University Drive.</p>
1145	2/27/2023	Kay Taliaferro	Email	<p>Mr. Stephen Endres: We are totally against the proposed by-pass Route C. We think you will disrupt so many more lives by picking Route C and the only common sense one is Route D. Would you want your life totally disrupted by no fault of your own? Please vote for Route D, Frances Kay Taliaferro</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1146	3/9/2023	Kayla Kirk	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Kayla Kirk</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1147	3/8/2023	Keith and Pat Faulkner	Email	<p>Dear Stephen,</p> <p>I would like to strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousand of citizens throughout McKinney. These are the facts presented by TxDOT in your February 2023 Announcement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Segment A destroys 27 businesses, 12 displacements and 2 homes currently. It will likely be more than that by the time the project is constructed whereas Segment B destroys no businesses, 7 displacements and 5 homes.</li> <li>2. The cost of Segment A right of way acquisition estimated today is \$957.8 million compared to \$888.8 million for Segment B. It is likely to reach more than \$1 Billion by the time the project is constructed based on current construction projects which are not counted in the current TxDOT estimates.</li> <li>3. The proposed Blue Alternative which includes Segment A calls for \$120 million from the City of McKinney for right of way acquisition which will be an unplanned tax burden to McKinney taxpayers. The amount of tax burden quite likely will increase as the cost of ROW acquisitions and related expenses increase.</li> <li>4. Segment A will have a significant detrimental impact on Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill which border the proposed construction of Segment A. It will create major traffic disruption, increased noise and increased health and environmental problems, not to mention the impact on schools, morning and afternoon traffic, and school zones divided by US 380 Segment A.</li> </ol> <p>I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks for your consideration.</p> <p>Keith &amp; Pat Faulkner  1000 Woodcliff Dr  McKinney TX 75072  Keith Faulkner  Splash of Color  6841 Virginia Parkway Suite 103-154  McKinney TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Right-of-way acquisition estimates were calculated using Collin County Appraisal District as a guide to come up with square footage cost. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled “The Purchase of Right of Way,” and “Relocation Assistance,” are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>http://www.splashofcolor.com            (800) 441-9064            (972) 437-5733</p>	<p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,</li> <li>-depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and</li> <li>-providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</li> </ul>
1148	3/9/2023	Keith Faulkner	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.            Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1149	3/16/2023	Keith Green	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,            I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, business, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Personally, Route C will destroy an area that I have known and loved as a long-time resident of Collin County. If Route C is imposed we will lose access to community riding arenas, wooded trails, and outdoor pursuits. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable. Thank you for taking the time to consider this change. Sincerely,            Keith Green</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
1150	4/20/2023	Keith H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Voicing strong opposition to Segment A. Segment B is less expensive and less impactful to people, businesses and the environment. Keep politics and power out of this decision -do what is right for the majority with the most benefit for the future.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1151	4/20/2023	Keith K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A will cost unnecessary extra tax dollars. Segment B is the best solution.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1152	4/20/2023	Keith P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to segment B this has been discussed for 15 years, move it north to limit the quality of life impact on established neighborhoods.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.  It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands
1153		Keith W. Andre	Comment Form	Please tell Prosper to get on board and allow "A" to cut across their south east corner	Your comment is noted.
1154	3/16/2023	Keith Wyrich	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1155	3/16/2023	Kelli Nimmer	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1156	3/22/2023	Kelly D Krueger	Email	Subject: No Freeway Do not break the law-"AGAIN" "DISCLOSURE is the LAW"	Your comment is noted.
1157	3/8/2023	Kelly Dieterich	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Kelly Dieterich Vice President of Club Finance e: [REDACTED] w: invitedclubs.com m: 508-982-6178	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
1158	3/16/2023	Kelly Jackson	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1159	4/20/2023	Kelly K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	LEGAL ACTION WILL BE TAKEN	Your comment is noted.
1160	2/17/2023	Kelly Nguyen	Email	Oppose Route C - the FM 2933 Portion #416 - #420	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1161	3/16/2023	Kelly Orsini	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1162	3/14/2023	Kelly Ritter	Email	<p>Hi Stephen,</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Kelly Ritter Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1163	3/9/2023	Kelly Stephenson	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1164	3/13/2023	Kelly Tenney	Email	<p>US 380 Bypass NE McKinney. C disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc. C affects and displaces 383% more homes(29 vs. 6), 300% more businesses (16 vs. 4), and more community resources. It is worse for the people of Collin county and worse for the animals and wildlife. Please oppose option C and choose option D.</p> <p>Thank you,                      Kelly Tenney                      Yours in Health,                      Kelly Tenney                      COPE Certified Health Coach                      Click on this link below for the free ebook                      Stop, Challenge, Choose                      3 Steps Toward Creating Optimal Health                      469-682-1057                      kellytenney.ichooseoptimalhealth.com</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p>
1165	3/16/2023	Kelsey Denne	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1166	2/28/2023	Kelsey Zucker	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,                      With great respect, I ask that you consider my comments below regarding the 380 bypass.                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.                      Reasons to consider OPPOSING Segment A:                      Costs taxpayers \$98.8 million more                      Impacts 57% more natural wetlands &amp; wildlife                      Negatively impacts Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods                      Reasons to SUPPORT Segment B:                      Requires 73% fewer business and residential displacements                      Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at U.S. 380 &amp; Custer Road                      14% shorter, saving time and money                      It seems like a no brainier to pick segment B - more cost effective, less environmental impact, and fewer interruptions to citizens and businesses.                      Thank you for your consideration,                      Kelsey Zucker                      Kelsey Zucker                      (513) 237-0051</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>Kelsey Zucker (513) 237-0051 [REDACTED]</p>	
1167	4/20/2023	Ken and Jimmie Bradley	Email	<p>Mr Endres, I'm writing about my concerns regarding the Segment A impacts on Tucker Hill. The below points are concerns by the entire neighborhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that Segment B impacts fewer homes</li> <li>• The fact that Segment B has less environmental impact than Segment A</li> <li>• The fact that Segment B is significantly financially less expensive than Segment A</li> <li>• TXDot's putting MainGait's concerns over the residents of Tucker Hill for whatever reason</li> <li>• Noise pollution affecting Tucker Hill residents</li> <li>• Community impacts affecting Tucker Hill residents</li> <li>• Aesthetic impacts affecting Tucker Hill residents</li> <li>• TXDots inaccurate traffic analysis</li> <li>• Community cohesion</li> <li>• Construction air and noise pollution affecting Tucker Hill residents</li> <li>• Segment A's shift closer to Tucker Hill without notice</li> <li>• Alleged invalid comments submitted by Bill Darling impersonating Tucker Hill residents</li> </ul> <p>I would just like to tell you that my husband and I are elderly and each have chronic health issues. My husband is a Vietnam Veteran and suffers from PTSD and Alzheimer's. I am a cancer survivor and also suffer from pulmonary lung issues. Also, I am concerned about the below and would appreciate you responding to each.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The apparent lack of studies regarding air quality. The quality of air we breathe is very important to our overall health. I fear that the construction while building Segment A and the ongoing air pollution after construction will be detrimental to our overall health.</li> <li>• The apparent lack of studies regarding noise pollution. Proper sleep and rest is important to us and I fear that the construction noise and the bypass traffic noise will be detrimental to our overall health.</li> <li>• I really don't understand the air and sound quality measures used. Can you explain them to me in layman's terms? Can you explain to me where the monitors were located in Tucker Hill for the studies?</li> <li>• Emergency response time during the constructing period. How will that be addressed?</li> <li>• What will happen to the overflow parking at Harvard Park when you take part of their parking lot? Will that overflow into Tucker Hill?</li> <li>• Please explain to me why TXDot put MainGait's concerns over the residents of Tucker Hill...</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for listening to my concerns. I look forward to your responses and pray that you will reconsider and NOT build the Segment A bypass. Ken and Jimmie Bradley</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway. Details of the traffic noise analysis and location of the noise receivers can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS. The receiver locations are on page 76.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>2301 Pearl Street Mckinney, TX 75071 Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The Segment A shift that was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>The current design shows that TxDOT would likely need to acquire the land where the last row of parking is for the Harvard Park parking lot. TxDOT does not anticipate that additional right-of-way beyond what is described in the DEIS will be needed for the project. If the property owner chooses to reconfigure parking due to the TxDOT ROW acquisition, they would have to do so on their own property. During the TxDOT ROW acquisition process, TxDOT hires a third party to appraise and assess any potential damage and if the building can still operate with its original purpose.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1168	4/20/2023	Ken C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Due to higher cost, more displacement, noise levels	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1169	2/22/2023	Ken Hoffman	Online	Please value our parks and wildlife. I support segment D.	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted.
1170	4/20/2023	Ken K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A route, yes to B route	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1171	4/1/2023	Ken McCarty	Email	Has anyone from Txdot looked at projects from other countries with similar problems? Has anyone considered building express lanes above the existing highway??? Like Singapore, São Paulo and many others? Cheaper, faster and with less traffic interruptions Please let me know Thanks Sent from my iPhone Ken McCarty (214)755-1202	Your comment is noted. Double decked (or elevated) freeway sections were considered during the Feasibility Study. It will not be further considered for the corridor because it would not substantially reduce the amount of right-of-way needed to construct the roadway, and it would be more expensive. It's important to note that TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove elevated freeways in several locations across the state, including I-35 in downtown Austin.
1172	3/7/2023	Ken Verdolivo	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, Ken Verdolivo Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1173	2/22/2023	Kennedy Echeverry	Online	I prefer option D! It is better for the community!! I have known this area since 1996 it is a beautiful area option D is much better for the community.	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1174	4/20/2023	Kenneth F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Absolutely route B. This shouldn't be a hard choice unless ulterior motives are involved.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1175	2/17/2023	Kenneth Lyday	Online	I have reviewed the "preferred alternative" proposal and have determined that I'm in favor of this option. I'm a 31-year resident of McKinney and have seen enormous growth and development in that time. In fact, I think we are "late to the table" from a timing standpoint. I say let's get on with it. Taking too much time!	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1176	2/22/2023	Kenneth McCarty	Online	Please please look at what other cities in other countries have done. They are building express lanes above the existing highway. Faster, cheaper and with less traffic interruptions. I have sent this suggestion in before but have never seen a response or anything!! The air above is free. I am disappointed that this was never considered	Your comment is noted. Double decked (or elevated) freeway sections were considered during the Feasibility Study. It will not be further considered for the corridor because it would not substantially reduce the amount of right-of-way needed to construct the roadway, and it would be more expensive. It's important to note that TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove elevated freeways in several locations across the state, including I-35 in downtown Austin.  Responses to all comments received during a public meeting comment period were included in summary documents posted on TxDOT's website.
1177	3/16/2023	Kenneth S. Becker	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1178	2/19/2023	Kenneth Seguin	Online	I totally support the latest plan proposed by TxDOT as shown in its fly-over video. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uRYj_BgIHlo&amp;fbclid=IwAROp_CBZeeHy7-DQfxCHyOjgEAfq-YW3f8iDPoJ_INVCSk2irSPSxdSO9N4">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uRYj_BgIHlo&amp;fbclid=IwAROp_CBZeeHy7-DQfxCHyOjgEAfq-YW3f8iDPoJ_INVCSk2irSPSxdSO9N4</a> It honors the Master Plan of Prosper Town Council and keeps the by-pass out of Prosper. It is minimum intrusion into McKinney as it goes north near Tucker Hill and then east above the Heatherwood subdivision. The plan (with an 8-lane Limited Access Roadway) should alleviate much of the traffic on Hwy 380.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1179	3/15/2023	Kenneth Seguin	Online	TxDOT made absolutely the right call with this latest iteration of a by-pass that goes through the unbuildable land just east of the Tucker Hill community. Don't cave in to the many residents of Tucker Hill (or McKinney government officials) who simply don't want the by-pass to close to their neighborhood. McKinney didn't want to widen US Hwy 380 nor sink a new Hwy 380 below ground level (like US Hwy 75 near SMU), so the by-pass through McKinney became the only reasonable alternative. Good call! Kenneth E. Seguin Colonel (Retired), USAF Immediate Past President Whitley Place HOA Prosper, TX	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1180	2/6/2023	Kenneth W. Browder	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1181	4/20/2023	Kenneth Y	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Why would we waste so much money on Segment A? Simple math tells you to say no, not to mention the bottle neck in traffic that will be created by having to make a 90 degree turn. Have you ever driven on the NTDR during rush hour north of the Galleria? A simple "S" turn created a traffic nightmare. Absolutely do not build segment "A".	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
1182	4/20/2023	Kenny D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	US 380 Proposed Route - NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1183	4/20/2023	Kenny G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1184	2/25/2023	Kenny Gregory	Email	Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B Thank you, Kenny Gregory Wyndsor Grove/The Heritage Community	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1185	4/20/2023	Kent H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to Segment "B", No to "A"	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1186	4/20/2023	Kent P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This seems fishy. It seems like the Darlings are holding this up. McKinney, offered a land swap but they turned down. Although for a good cause, it is just a way for the Darlings property to sky rocket. Either y'all are naive or taking "favors"	Comment noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1187	3/15/2023	Kerry Doke	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and 20 year resident of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. It is my understanding that TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Kerry Doke Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1188	3/8/2023	Kevin and Carol Harned	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Kevin and Carol Harned	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1189	2/25/2023	Kevin and Elle Walsh	Email	Comment: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B Dear Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I just don't understand how a proposition that has been thoroughly argued against, destroys a ton of wild life habitats, as well as small businesses and disrupts homes could be picked as the best option. As an educated thinker it does not make any sense and makes me wonder if this was a political decision instead of a decision that has been researched to find the best course of action. Again, as a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Kevin & Elle Walsh Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.  Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.  For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1190	4/20/2023	Kevin B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>As a McKinney resident, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B ignores the findings of the environmental study, applies criteria to support this decision inconsistently, is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers and places an unsupportable financial burden on the City of McKinney and its taxpayers. Findings of the Environmental Impact Study should have led to selection of Segment B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No businesses displaced, rather than 15 current businesses displaced in Segment A.</li> <li>● 2 rather than 7 major utility conflicts in Segment A</li> <li>● No hazardous material sites impacted, rather than 2 in Segment A.</li> <li>● Nearly twice the impact to rivers and streams; 1/2 mile vs. 1 mile</li> <li>● Segment A impacts more than 30 irreplaceable Heritage trees, aged over 150 years. Segment B saves over \$150 million dollars for Collin County Taxpayers vs. Segment A</li> <li>● \$153M in right of way costs, rather than \$198M in Segment A.</li> <li>● \$25M in utility relocation costs, rather than \$75 in Segment A.</li> <li>● \$588M in design and construction costs rather than \$608M in Segment A.</li> <li>● \$40M savings in utility relocation for the City of McKinney. TXDOT's own findings indicate that the continued emphasis on ManeGait is unwarranted.</li> <li>● The design updates to Segment B have fully mitigated any impact to ManeGait</li> <li>● TXDOT has received a copy of a study from Shea Center &amp; Dreamcatchers, California service ranch with a similar project that impacted their area which found there was minimal impact.</li> <li>● TXDOT has said that Segment B "would not make the ManeGait inaccessible to persons with disabilities and would not violate the Americans with Disabilities Act"</li> </ul> <p>Priority has not been given to safety and the increased risk of fatal accidents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Segment A contains two 90 degree turns with a change of grade which will present a greater risk of fatal accidents.</li> <li>● TXDOT did not reveal the comparison between fatality analysis for Segment A &amp; B Segment A involves reconstructing an additional 3.8 miles of existing 380 Highway increasing the risk of work zone accidents, and disrupting existing traffic patterns.</li> <li>● According to TXDOT, 26,000 work zone crashes in 2021 resulted in 244 deaths.</li> <li>● The extended construction time required to regrade the existing road bed will increase the disruption to existing traffic for several years of construction. Criteria used to support Segment selection was not applied consistently. The criteria applied to recommend Segment C, would conclude Segment B is the preferred option.</li> <li>● C vs. D was compared based on objective cost data</li> <li>● A vs. B comparison featured subjective measures, such as counting the number of comments submitted vs. objective facts</li> </ul> <p>The current TXDOT budget and plans do not include the mitigation</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. TxDOT is also still evaluating the impacts of the Segment A shift which was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing. It did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>measures necessary to address the impact of increased environmental and noise pollution, as well as concerning traffic hazards, for the current McKinney neighborhoods impacted by Segment A. In addition to the depressed roadway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sound wall across the full length of Tucker Hill property fronting 380 consistent with the character of the entry being removed and providing privacy from cut thru traffic. Built in tandem with an independent firm with expertise in the physics of sound.</li> </ul> <p>The extension of Stonebridge Drive and new entrance on Townsend Boulevard for Tucker Hill residents in the character of the current entrance at Tremont Boulevard</p>	<p>35 interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT provides a summary of fatal and injury crashes by alternative on page 2-33 of the DEIS.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>
1191	2/17/2023	Kevin Baumgarten	Online	<p>Roll 13, inset G.</p> <p>I am concerned with access to my neighborhood during and after this project. Access to the Stickhorse estates and CR1084 is very limited already. The access off of CR330 is very poorly conceived, especially in context of this and the other Princeton segment coming together right at the single entrance to the neighborhood. It requires an unprotected left turn across 3 lanes of traffic right at the start of the new segment C, where traffic will be accelerating. It also removes the pseudo-protected turn option that is currently available on the western entrance to CR330 (thanks to the recent stop light added for the construction dump to the south). An east bound frontage road lane, north of 380, connecting 1827 and CR330 would greatly simplify access to a neighborhood that has at least 30 residences, and numerous small businesses, and ensure reasonable access to the neighborhood throughout construction, with minimal additional displacement impacts.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Design in this area is still underway and will connect all three projects. A future Public Hearing for the Princeton project will be held to provide more details and an updated design. You can find project information and to sign up to receive Public Hearing notices at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a>.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1192	4/3/2023	Kevin Baumgarten	Online	I oppose segment C as drawn. The project details are vague and limited with regards to how access to the stickhorse estate's neighborhood will be maintained through out construction of not only this segment, but also the Princeton loop and the Spur which intersect at this location. Details of the surface streets are vague and even conflicting across the 3 project plans. This will disturb the access to over 30 homes for multiple years of construction. I favor moving the end of segment C slightly west, and providing clear surface street access to the neighborhoods north of 380 in the town of New Hope and it's surrounding ETJ, that will be available throughout the construction of these projects.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. Design in this area is still underway and will connect all three projects. A future Public Hearing for the Princeton project will be held to provide more details and an updated design. You can find project information and to sign up to receive Public Hearing notices at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a>.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p>
1193	4/19/2023	Kevin Campbell	Email	<p>My name is Kevin Campbell and I live with my parents in Tucker Hill. I am outraged over the recommendation of Segment A over Segment B. This is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more. I worry about the tremendous amount of Money wasted and how it will affect future generations. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of Segment A for the 380 bypass, TxDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents This does not make sense. I have just been diagnosed with diabetes and my internist insisted I get pneumonia vaccine. I'm concerned that the pollution from the 380 project will negatively affect my health as well as my parents Please do not proceed with this project without a rigorous study of all pollutants that cause harm to humans and a rigorous health impact analysis to understand both current and future problems. This project should not proceed until these studies are completed. Tucker Hill is a very unique front porch community. I spend a lot of time on our porches and walking the neighborhood. Can u guarantee that 380 will Not be detrimental to my health and well being after construction and during construction due to the excessive noise and environmental pollution? Have you researched the correlation between noise and mental and physical health? This can be very stressful and detrimental to everyone's health and well being. I'm also concerned about emergency vehicle access to Tucker Hill. Can you guarantee that Stonebridge will be completed before any construction on 380 Is started in front of Tucker Hill? Why can't the outer loop be used as a solution? Wouldn't it make more sense to connect to NDT and 35??? If the 380 segment A is selected and all the studies regarding our health are completed you must promise a depressed 380 in front of Tucker hill with large sound barriers. I can't even imagine how loud the noise will be. Why are we the only neighborhood that will be affected on 2 sides Thanks in advance for your consideration to all my questions. Kevin Campbell</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with FHWA NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. More information about the necessary steps to identify and address community impacts on a TxDOT project can be found at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf</a>.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. TxDOT conducted a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis including benzene and VOCs (Section 3.12.3 of the DEIS), and a Carbon Monoxide Traffic Air Quality analysis (CO TAQA - Section 3.12.2 of the DEIS), included in Appendix P of the DEIS. None of the modeled carbon monoxide concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. The CAL3QHC air dispersion model parameters used in the CO TAQA are specified in the TxDOT Environmental Guide: Volume 2 Activity Instructions (DEIS Appendix P, CO TAQA Technical Report, Table 12). The wind speed used was 1 meter per second (m/s), equivalent to 2.24 miles per hour.</p> <p>The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>████████████████████ Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's</p> <p>According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1194	2/6/2023	Kevin Garcia	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1195	4/1/2023	Kevin Maldonado	Online	Love my home and neighborhood but the distance from the proposed sight of the highway makes me wonder if mckinney is where I want the stay	Your comment is noted.
1196	4/20/2023	Kevin S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1197	1/26/2023	Kevin Smith	Email	Stephen, I read that there is a meeting on this in February. I also read that you are going to utilize Option A. That means that the expansion will go right through our land. What do we have to do to get things resolved? We have been unable to begin construction on our restaurant for obvious reasons, but that means we have been making payments on the land loan for almost a year, which is very damaging for us. Thanks, Kevin	Your comment is noted. Environmental clearance for the project is anticipated in September of 2023. After that, acquisition of proposed right-of-way (ROW) will occur. Property owners impacted by displacement will be contacted by TxDOT ROW agents and are entitled to adequate compensation and relocation assistance, among other services. Section 3.1, as well as figures 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 of the DEIS provide additional information about ROW acquisition and displacements.
1198	3/16/2023	Kevin Spann	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1199	4/20/2023	Kim B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1200	3/7/2023	Kim Babka	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Enders, I sincerely hope my voice will be heard as a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas. My father a resident since 1936. I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A for the 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. As well, I know of the alternative option, segment B that is more cost effective which would reduce the tax burden on our McKinney residents, destroy fewer homes and businesses and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 resident in Stonebridge Ranch and thousands others throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Kim Babka</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1201	3/15/2023	Kim Bentley	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Stephen Endres I am writing to express my strong opposition of segment C on the 380 North Texas bypass. The development of this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• Destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>• Disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• Eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/ threatened species.</li> <li>• Affects and displaces 383% more homes (29 vs. 6), 300% more businesses (16 vs. 4), and more community resources.</li> </ul> <p>Sincerely, Kim Bentley, CHCP Continuing Education Programs Manager T (972) 830-7826 [REDACTED] Vizient 290 E John Carpenter Fwy Irving, TX 75062 vizientinc.com Continuing Education</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1202	4/20/2023	Kim C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A will cause irreparable harm to the residential segments known as Stonebridge Ranch as well as lowering safety and value to family structure within that area.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
1203	3/13/2023	Kim Carmichael	Email	<p>Hi - I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. As you know this was granted in the last round of comments and we have upcoming meetings to discuss several new developments. Thank you,                      Kim Carmichael   Renewal Program Manager                      [REDACTED]                      Adobe Authorized Reseller for Connect, Captivate and Adobe Learning Manager                      www.getconnect.com</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
1204	4/20/2023	Kim Carmichael	Email	<p>To whom it may concern,                      My husband and I live at 7709 Townsend Blvd in the Tucker Hill community of McKinney. I have been involved with working on keeping our community safe and out of the path of the 380 Bypass from the beginning. We helped push for the Segment B option, and it was looking as if TxDOT would choose that route, at least in 2022 but money, power, and politics always win against the small Taxpaying Homeowners. So here we are with TxDOT choosing Segment A and spending over 200 million more of our money on an option that makes no sense, has a dangerous 90-degree turn, takes out our only entrance, encroaches on more wetlands, affects more streams and rivers, and gives preferential treatment to a horse ranch and their visitors over homeowners who live in the affect area daily. It appears irrefutable that Segment B is the better alternative and that there are serious flaws in the conclusions reached by TxDOT and in the underlying Environmental Impact Study (EIS).</p> <p>Why are Segment decisions made with inconsistencies ? We were told the comments are a small part of the decision, while those in Segment B were told that the decision was made because more comments came in against</p>	<p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary</i></p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>B. Why was the traffic study done during the 2020 pandemic when no one was driving to work, so that the noise and air pollution did not show accurate levels? Why was one mph shown as the normal wind speed in the study? Why did TxDOT tell our elected officials that there was nothing they could do to influence the decision but tell those impacted to go to their elected officials to push them to influence the alignment choices? Why does it appear that more intense study was done to the affects of a bypass to ManeGate than to Tucker Hill, as our parks, pool, clubhouse etc. were not identified so no impact studies were done? Is TxDOT pushing the Bypass thru to gain federal funding while available, without doing their due diligence to study the full effects to the Homeowners and businesses involved? What is the plan for emergency services, school busses and individuals to enter and exit the Tucker Hill community during construction? If the City of McKinney cannot come up with the money to move utilities where will this money come from? Will or can Segment A shift closer to Tucker Hill, without study to affects of the shft? How do paid lobbyist effect the decision making process? We have seen that money and influence obviously have effects.</p> <p>Please do not proceed with this project without a rigorous study of all pollutants that cause harm to humans and a rigorous health impact analysis to understand both current and future impacts. If TxDOT will not mitigate these harms, then TxDOT should at the very least do a rigorous analysis of these harms and explicitly note the opportunities we for go with the current preferred alignment. See attached document outlining all the inconsistencies we have found in the EIS study, also the areas we believe need more study to see the actual impacts to our neighborhood as well as the other affected by Segment A.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	
1205	3/1/2023	Kim Gilani	Email	<p>I would like to provide feedback regarding Segment A: As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas, I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, Kim Gilani Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1206	4/20/2023	Kim H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Segment A would completely destroy Tucker Hill as we know it. Countless scores of families enjoy our ambience and unique neighborhood during all of the holiday seasons, whether it is pumpkin patches, Christmas Light displays or taking pictures in front of the fountain. Not to mention the beautiful irreplaceable old trees that grace our entry - they will be destroyed.</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1207	3/6/2023	Kim Himes	Online	<p>Segment A and Segment B are equal in terms of congestion, moving speed, and LOS considerations. A would cost \$74.7 million to relocate and accommodate the SEVEN major utility conflicts as opposed to B cost of only \$25.4 mill and only TWO potential utility conflicts. That is a \$49.3 million dollar SAVINGS to Taxpayers if B is implemented. Segment A would include at least FIFTEEN business displacements cost of \$200 million dollars in ROW B would have ZERO business displacements, and cost only \$152 million.</p> <p>re: ManeGate                      NOISE ANALYSIS RESULTS AND RESEARCH OF SIMILAR THERAPEUTIC HORSEMANSHIP FACILITIES show Segment B WOULD NOT MAKE THE MANEGATE FACILITY INACCESSIBLE TO PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES, NOR WOULD BUILDING THERE VIOLATE THE ADA. In Tucker Hill, we have many Seniors with Disabilities , and the added congestion, noise and air pollution, and traffic congestion to get to the area hospital and medical facilities would be a direct violation of their rights, and dangerous.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1208	3/6/2023	Kim Himes	Email	<p>Good afternoon Madison!                      I'm hoping you remember me - I was the almost 6 foot tall blonde lady who you spoke with after you gave the interview to the lady with the purple hair - how's that for some visual prompting? :)))-Anyway, you were very kind to speak with me for a long while, and I really appreciated your candor. Just to jog your memory, I had mentioned to you that I live in Tucker Hill, and am concerned re: the "preferred alternative" route that TXDOT is considering. I wanted to get some more information from you, and would like to know if you are able to furnish this particular information, as a matter of public record, and if not, would you please direct me to the appropriate party who can? -The first thing is, I would like to request the contact information for a couple of folks. I'm trying to reach out to Michael Morris, and also Ceason Clemens. I know that Mr. Morris is the Regional Transportation Director of Collin County, but I am unsure what Ms. Clemens title is, or what part she plays in this. If you would please provide that, I would be so grateful!- Secondly, I need a definition - is this action being taken by TXDOT considered to be eminent domain? There is some confusion about that out here - some businesses are indicating that it is, but that's not what I understood.-Thirdly, you mentioned to me that night that TXDOT has several hurdles to overcome prior to beginning this project involving the "preferred alternative" as it has been outlined currently - those included completing an environmental study, securing funding for the project, and securing/purchasing the right-of-way from Southern Land Company (as it relates to Tucker Hill directly). Have I understood those three initial things correctly? And, btw.. Has TXDOT already secured the right of way from Billingsly, the owner of the land that surrounds Tucker Hill? Also, when was this preferred alternative broached? Was it prior to November of 2022? I'm asking this question because I noticed that there was a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019 in regards to the NEPA assignment. Who would that Memorandum of Understanding have been sent to? Would it have been disclosed to Southern Land Company and the Billingsly family at that time? -And lastly - who would have the final say as to when the "public hearing" period is concluded? And, if as you indicated to me in February, that the public commentary received was so far in favor of a shift from B to A, will there also be disclosure re: the public commentary percentages as they stand right now (prior to March 21st) that is available?-Thank you for your time in reading this through Madison. As I indicated, if information I am requesting is "above your pay grade" so to speak, in the interest of time, please direct me to that person/persons. Thanks so much!                      Kim Himes, Broker, Realtor, CNE                      469-441-9611                      [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Mr. Morris's information can be found on the NCTCOG website. He is not employed by Collin County. You can reach him at 817-695-9241. Ms. Clemens is the TxDOT Dallas District Engineer. She oversees all the planning projects, traditional construction, and multiple district-led design-build projects in the Dallas area. She can be reached at 214-320-6100 or ceason.clemens@txdot.gov.</p> <p>Once the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been completed and the record of the decision has been issued, if a build alternative is selected in the record of decision, then TxDOT will begin the right-of-way acquisition process to purchase property needed for the project. This process includes negotiating prices with property owners so owners will receive a fair-market-value price. TxDOT may condemn the property through its power of eminent domain to acquire the property, after exhausting all alternative efforts.</p> <p>While eminent domain refers to the legal authority of the state or another entity to acquire private property for public use, condemnation is the legal process under which the state may acquire private property for public use. Entities authorized with the power of eminent domain cannot acquire a landowner's private property, which can include land and certain improvements located on that property, without providing adequate compensation (fair market value).</p> <p>TxDOT recognizes that using the power of eminent domain requires balancing the rights of private property owners and the needs of the public and is committed to working fairly with property owners through the negotiation process or condemnation proceedings.</p> <p>There are several steps that need to be completed before this project can proceed. The three you mentioned are some of the factors that need to be completed. After the FEIS is completed and the Record of Decision (ROD) is issued at the end of the year, if a build alternative is selected in the record of decision, then the final design, and right of way acquisition needs to begin and be completed, along with the utility coordination. While those last steps are being completed, the funding for completion of the construction of the project needs to be secured. Throughout this project, there have been opportunities for property owners who will be directly impacted to have their questions answered. Property owners from whom property needs to be acquired will be contacted for right-of-way mapping and appraisals. After the ROD, offers will be made to property owners. No property has been purchased by TxDOT yet in regard to the project. Again, all of this depends on there being a build alternative selected in the record of decision, which has not yet been determined.</p> <p>The preferred alternative was a part of the Feasibility Study completed in 2020 and subsequently part of the current DEIS. Although TxDOT recommended a single alignment at the conclusion of the Feasibility Study,</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>there were some other alternatives that are also reasonable, and those alternatives required more detailed study during the environmental review (NEPA) phase of the project, including alternatives that were eliminated during the Feasibility Study. Because this phase of the project involves a more detailed evaluation and collection of new information, it is possible that data being gathered in the environmental review process could change previously studied alignments or lead TxDOT to consider new alternatives.</p> <p>The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) as presented in TxDOT's documents and meetings is not project specific, so it is not an agreement about US 380. It is an agreement between TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that allows TxDOT to have the responsibility for the approval of environmental documents under a program called "NEPA assignment". It's a requirement to include that statement on all documents and display it at public involvement events, so people are aware that TxDOT's Environmental Affairs Division Director is approving the document.</p> <p>This US 380 project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was Jan. 13, 2023. TxDOT has granted a 15-day extension to the comment period and it will now close April 5. Any communication made in February about the nature of the comments received were reflective of comments received prior to the February 2023 public hearings and described in the Segment Analysis Matrix. For all public commentary, TxDOT tries to be accommodating in receiving feedback. It is important to understand, the preferred alignment is not a vote and public input is only one factor that TxDOT considers when selecting the preferred alignment.</p>
1209	2/25/2023	Kim Howell	Online	<p>"I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I have cancer and was planning to move in with my son..</li> <li>2) My son and his wife who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced. Including their newborn!</li> <li>3) Section C will displace their neighbors as well, 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>5) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>6) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>7) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>8) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however,</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1210	3/15/2023	Kim Kleppe	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Kim Kleppe</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1211	3/16/2023	Kim Leggette	Email	<p>Stephen, Please do not cave into to political pressure from a judge that lives in the Tucker Hill community in McKinney, TX. There is no rational reason to route the Hwy 380 bypass through Prosper, TX. The proposed route through Propser, TX goes by schools and a horse farm that supports the disabled. McKinney's lack of planning should not be Propser's problem. Please keep 380 on 380 or select the route that takes it through McKinney. Kim Leggette 910 Evergreen Dr. Prosper, TX 75078 Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1212	3/10/2023	Kim Milano	Online	I do not accept option A. I do not want option A - full stop. It is a poor decision. B is Less impactful all around and less expensive. It really makes little to no sense why A was chosen. If A is chosen, I'd like to see sound walls in front of tucker hill and along the east side of TH. I'd like to see slower speed limits on the frontage road and the bypass. Depressed roadway. Trees planted. I'd like the city to give the streets to TH and to maintain them as if they were city streets but by passing ownership allow us to turn Tucker Hill to a gated community avoiding the inevitable increased traffic from people who have no business entering the neighborhood. Helping with criminal activity along a major highway.	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>Based on the schematic design shown at the Public Hearing, TxDOT is proposing the depression of the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>City governments and TxDOT must conduct traffic and engineering studies according to requirements outlined in TxDOT's publication, Procedures for Establishing Speed Zones, when setting a speed limit on the state highway system. Usually, speed limits on urban curbed frontage roads are 40 to 45 mph.</p>
1213	3/8/2023	Kim Woodruff	Email	Dear Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for your support, Kim Woodruff 5002 Timber Circle Dr. McKinney, TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1214	4/20/2023	Kimberley N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1215	3/29/2023	Kimberly Kenia	Online	We bought our home to escape the hustle, we chose our location as it was quiet and surrounded by farmland. We were told a bypass was going in but no more than 4 lanes. We know the road needs to be expanded but when you are looking to put a freeway through the center of our quiet peaceful community you are doing so at the expense of the families who live there. With this we will see an increase in noise pollution, increase in crime as a freeway provides easy in and out access to criminals and a decrease in our property values and peace of mind.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.  Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.
1216	3/13/2023	Kimberly Milano	Email	I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. Thank you.	This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.  Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1217	2/19/2023	Kimberly Stafford	Email	I strongly oppose Route C for the 380 Bypass project. Route D affects less homes and businesses and is a better option for the community Thank you, Kimberly Stafford	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.
1218	3/15/2023	Kimm Sinho	Online	Hi! I do not support section E and would instead prefer the existing 380 section F.	Your comment and opposition of Segment E is noted. The Green Alternative, or Segment F, from Coit Road to FM 1827 was identified during the Feasibility Study, but ultimately was not carried forward for further analysis after because it would have displaced more than 30 residents and 200 businesses including Raytheon.
1219	4/20/2023	Kirk R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Stop segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1220	4/20/2023	Kirk W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A. YEs To Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1221	2/25/2023	Kirsty Bishop	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Kirsty Bishop	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1222	2/27/2023	Kit Tozier	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 18/27. Kit Tozier Senior Loan Processor NMLS # 941160 Highlands Residential Mortgage 7500 Dallas Parkway Suite 150 Plano, TX 75024 Cell: 214-404-0179 Fax: 469-310-0221 [REDACTED]	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1223	2/25/2023	KM L	Online	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, and rationally and objectively reviewing the pros and cons of the two, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Please reconsider the impacts to our community. Thank you!	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1224	3/7/2023	Korey Hicks	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Korey Hicks Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1225	2/16/2023	Krista Rogers	Online (2)	route d is a much less intrusive option to our citizens and the families that inhabit other zone options. please do not displace and financially impact the families of our community when it is avoidable	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1226	4/20/2023	Kristen M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1227	3/16/2023	Kristen Vartian	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1228	4/20/2023	Kristi M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to option A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1229	3/23/2023	Kristi Martinez	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Kristi Martinez Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1230	2/17/2023	Kristi Sherman	Online	<p>"I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1231	3/15/2023	Kristi Tyler	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Kristi Tyler Ridgecrest</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1232	4/20/2023	Kristin H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	SUPPORT OPTION B! As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1233	2/17/2023	Kristin Mycke	Email	Mr. Endres, I am writing to support Route D and oppose Route C for the 380 bypass route. Route C will cause too much turmoil and difficulty for existing residents. Route D is a less destructive option. Please extended support of Route C. Kristin Mycke Collin County Property Owner.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1234	2/18/2023	Kristy McCoy	Email	<p>I'm writing this email in support of proposed Route D, which goes through the flood plain and disrupts 7 homes as opposed to the 29 homes on Route C. If C goes through as planned, so many more people will be displaced and community resources will be impacted. Texas Parks and wildlife are also supporting, as far as I can tell, Route D due to its lowered impact on wetlands and threatened species. I am sure there are many many factors that come into play when choosing routes, but please strongly consider Route D. Sincerely,            Kristy McCoy            Collin County resident</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. It outlines that for an EIS project, TxDOT is supposed to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things that TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
1235	3/15/2023	Kristy Seymour	Email	<p>Hello,            As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,            Kristy Seymour</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1236	4/17/2023	Kristy Tebbetts	Email	<p>Good afternoon, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney.</p> <p>I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for considering, Kristy Tebbetts</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1237	4/14/2023	Kurt Wiest	Online	I have been following the progress of planned improvements to US380, specifically alternatives A and B. I support alternative B. We are currently building a home in the Wilmeth Ridge development and obviously have a vested interest in the outcome of a final decision. However, neither A or B would directly impact our home plans from a sound or sight perspective. I do believe the western portion of the improvements would be better served by alternative B. It has less impact on the existing Tucker Hill development as well as businesses in the rural portions of the proposed ROW. In addition, the flow of highway traffic would be less impeded by design factors requiring two 90 degree turns.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>
1238	4/20/2023	Kyle H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	supprt segment b	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1239	4/20/2023	Kyle S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is a better choice than A due to lower cost, less disruption to existing businesses, and avoidance of two right angle turns, which are problematic for any throughway project.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1240	3/22/2023	Kyle Voigt	Online	I don't see the need of doing any work on 380 East of Custer Rd. The growth that has been projected for Collin County is going to be primarily in Prosper, Celina, and Frisco and this is where the roads need to be expanded, etc. The growth projections themselves are incorrect as the percentage increases of the past couple of years are not sustainable. I view Hwy. 380 in a similar vain as Northwest Hwy in Dallas and there was never a push to turn it into a major highway.	Your comment is noted. More detail about the project's purpose and need is included in the Section 1.0 of the DEIS and future traffic projections are available in Appendix I.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1241	3/16/2023	Kynzie Dearden	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1242	3/15/2023	L P	Online	I oppose Route C of the 380 Bypass in North Texas.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1243	3/15/2023	L R	Online	My family and I have been living in McKinney since 1999, we are VERY excited in this new prospective highway - however we are fans of the Route B originally presented.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1244	2/17/2023	L. Knight	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Section C will displace 4X the residents and businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>2) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1245	4/20/2023	L. T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am against option A. Option A is irresponsible. I am for option B which doesn't waste tax payer dollars, disrupt neighborhoods and businesses. it is shameful important information is being overlooked because of MainGate and politics. Option B is clearly financially and environmentally the correct option. Please consider community input.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1246	2/17/2023	L.V.	Email	I support of Route D, which goes through the flood plain and disrupts 7 homes as opposed to the 29 homes on Route C. Txdot has said that comments matter. Please make mention that our property is a community resource (Theraputic riding, church and community riding and events etc). In addition 8 lanes is overkill and a waste of money , our money.	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1247	2/20/2023	L.V.	Email	<p>Subject: I do not support plan c                      Sir, I am aware of that there are several plans for the construction of the bypass.                      What not make the decision that is better for the life of many people.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>
1248	2/6/2023	La Cour Venue	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT                      US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.  Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.
1249	3/8/2023	Lainie Reed	Online	I would like to make a comment regarding the U.S. 380 project Segment C. Please go back to Segment D to spare Tara Royal Equestrian Center and all the others effected. Tara Royal is an exquisite property that is a rare find today. The DFW area has lost Preston Trails, Willow Bend, Los Colinas, Dura Mater, Indian Creek, and many more due to development. As a horse owner myself, my two acre place is now surrounded by Bowen road, five Lanes, Arkansas also five Lanes and Pioneer Parkway, six Lanes. There is road noise, pollution and a lot of traffic. There are days when I walk on my pasture with my horses and the exhaust is overwhelming. I was born and raised in Dallas, and I now live in Dalworthington Gardens surrounded by Arlington for 35 years and have seen a lot of changes. Please leave the magnificent Tara Royal to live on and not to meet with the same fate as a lot of the Dallas Equestrian Centers. Thank-you.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C and support of Segment D is noted.
1250	3/7/2023	Lance Gammill	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, Lance and Jennifer Gammill 1904 Camberton Drive McKinney, TX 75071 Lance	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1251	3/16/2023	Lance Kimes	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1252	2/28/2023	Lark Allen	Email	<p>Hello,                      I am very concerned about the possibility of what would happen if proposal C took place~                      C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County.                      C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.                      C disturbs the wetlands that serve as a refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.                      C eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.                      C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D).                      C divides residential and farming/ranching communities.                      C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources.                      C has worse traffic performance (lower traffic capacity,                      Also, I drive in this area and it is already stressful enough! I do not consent to damage to these areas while also creating more stress for the human inhabitants.                      Thank you,                      Lark Allen                      Lark Allen, Happiness Mentor Inc. and Market Mentor with Monat ~  <a href="https://healintohappiness.com/">https://healintohappiness.com/</a>  <a href="http://yourhairwillloveyou.mymonat.com/">http://yourhairwillloveyou.mymonat.com/</a>                      972.489.4901                      May all your dreams come true!</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1253	4/20/2023	Larry B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1254	2/25/2023	Larry Collins	Email	Mr. Endres, I know there is an organized email campaign to oppose the proposed Segment A-E-C. but I AGREE with the proposal as it stands. Segment B is much longer and cuts across much more land having much more environmental impact. The Country Clubbers of Stone Bridge will just have to adapt to a new reality. Do not be dissuaded. Cheers! Larry Collins McKinney / Collin County resident since 2012 3604 Apple Blossom Ln McKinney, TX 75070	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1255	3/7/2023 3/15/2023	Larry Hoffman	Email (2)	Mr. Endres, Can you please provide me with rationale behind selecting to more expensive and impactful Segment A over Segment B? I have reviewed the TXDOT documents and am unable to find anything that justifies the selection of Segment A over B. Larry Hoffman [REDACTED]	Your comment is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B  TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. You can also reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33 and the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1256	4/20/2023	Larry P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a taxpayer I am highly concerned that TxDOT has chosen the more costly option that will destroy existing businesses and residents. Choose Segment B! Therefore, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and STRONGLY SUPPORT the construction of Segment B construction option. THANK YOU VERY MUCH!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1257	4/20/2023	Larry R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Opposed to segment A and fully support segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1258	3/8/2023	Larry Thrash	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1259	3/31/2023	Larry Truesdale	Online	Option B is clearly better than option A. The right angle turn in A is sure to cause more congestion, noise (from slowing down and speeding up), concentrate polutuon, and more accidents. Both choices will negatively impact people. My understandjng is B is less expensive than A. That savings can and should be used to depresss the roadway and take whatever action you can to reduce noise.	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>The current design for the project does call for the depression of the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
1260	4/20/2023	Laura A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1261	2/26/2023	Laura Allen	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. For the McKinney families with students traveling to the high school this is a major issue. Thank you, Laura Allen	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative (as well as all Build Alternatives) effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.
1262	3/14/2023	Laura Alton	Email	I oppose route C - it is very destructive I support route D - it is minimal displacement Laura Alton 214-641-3212	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.
1263	3/11/2023	Laura and Rickie Glenn	Email	We adamantly oppose the proposed bypass segment A, preferred by txdot and support B. Along with the city of McKinney's numerous letters of opposition to txdot for years opposing segment A, we agree segment B would be the preferred choice. Why must McKinney harbor all the burden; displace businesses, create even heavier traffic congestion due to construction, and disrupt several established neighborhoods ( Tucker, Stonebridge, Wren Creek, Arbor Hills) and private residences that have been here for years! Why does Prosper bear no burden? Our entire Tucker Hill neighborhood will be directly impacted for years! Our property values will most certainly be negatively affected. You are proposing a major highway on TWO sides of our homes in TH!! Please hear our pleas from the 1500 + residents in Tucker Hill! We have personally lived here 12 years and have such a welcoming, supportive community, but we do not welcome a major highway surrounding us! No amount of sound barriers are going to alleviate the inevitable noise. Thank you for your consideration, Laura and Rickie Glenn	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. While the Preferred Alternative is adjacent to the neighborhoods you mention, it does not bisect any existing subdivisions. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1264	4/20/2023	Laura and Rickie Glenn	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,            We are longtime residents of Tucker Hill. We moved here from Plano in 2010 when TH was just beginning; 4-5 streets of homes, 380 was just a two lane asphalt road, and there was no retail development to speak of. As TH inevitably grew, we welcomed the 6 lane expansion of 380, curbs, welcomed the traffic light at Tremont for safer access( our only access) to our community, and welcomed the development of retail. So, we completely understand the need for a 380 bypass. When segment B was presented as the best solution; the least disruptive solution to family homes and property values, less threat to new businesses that are less than a year of opening, less impact to our natural environment, less impact to our air and sound quality, and finally less impact on our REAL lives, of course, we rallied behind it! Who wouldn't? Our homes were threatened! We ( TH, Stonebridge) have rallied for segment B, written letters for B, attended countless community and city meetings in hopes that our pleas would be heard and understood in our support for Segment B. And now, , we're offering our pleas again. Segment B is by far the least intrusive, and the least incredibly expensive option for our community. We hope and pray you would reconsider your preference.            Laura and Rickie Glenn            2313 Grassmere Lane            McKinney            Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1265	3/11/2023	Laura and Tom Donahue	Email	<p>Hello Mr. Endres,            We and most of our neighbors are strongly opposed to option A being considered as part of route 380 expansion. We feel this would directly and negatively impact our Stonebridge Ranch neighborhood and the property values of the homes in Stonebridge Ranch, most especially those north of Virginia where our home is. Should those property values fall it will result in a lowering property taxes and therefore, a lowering of the amount of money going into the City of McKinney for ongoing projects. These are some of the highest property taxes in McKinney. We also feel it would also negatively impact the businesses and properties along 380 east of Custer. Several are already slated to close! This is a massive undertaking and will prove in the long run to be detrimental to McKinney as a whole. Please please reroute the route 380 expansion two option B.            Laura and Tom Donahue            601 Rosebury Circle            McKinney, TX 75071            214-585-1966</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1266	3/15/2023	Laura Arouca	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Laura Arouca	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1267	4/20/2023	Laura B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A is a ridiculous waste of money.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1268	4/20/2023	Laura Bull	Email	To whom it may concern: I am quite concerned about the TXDOT recommendation to chose A over Segment B. As a mother, I fear for the safety of my family with the increased traffic and unsafe driving conditions that will ensue during the construction phase. We have no option but to drive straight into the mess as we do not have another exit. And even if the city can build us one in time, we still have to cross the bypass to get to our children's elementary school as this bypass will cut my entire neighborhood off from our zoned school.  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.  Access to Tucker Hill would be maintained along the Preferred Alternative including an at-grade connection at Tremont Boulevard over the depressed section of the new freeway and a connection to existing US 380 east of Tucker Hill which would allow school buses and parents to access Reeves Elementary School via Auburn Hills Parkway and future Ridge Road.  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
1269	4/20/2023	Laura C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, Test to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1270	2/25/2023	Laura Carpenter	Email	TXDOT, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. If not Sement B, then NO build at all. Laura Carpenter Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1271	4/20/2023	Laura D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A - YES TO SEGMENT B!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1272	2/22/2023	Laura Davis	Online	I vote to support D	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1273	4/20/2023	Laura G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B!! Save our homes!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1274	4/20/2023	Laura N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1275	3/9/2023	Laura Procaccini	Email (3)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1276	4/20/2023	Laura R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	no to segment A, Yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1277	4/17/2023	Laura Sherwood	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Laura Sherwood	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1278	4/20/2023	Laura W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A. Yes to B. B is the only logical option cost wise and safety wise.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1279	4/20/2023	Laura W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to Segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1280	3/7/2023	Lauren Allan	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks, Lauren Allan Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1281	4/20/2023	Lauren K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1282	3/6/2023	Lauren Landmark	Email	<p>Hi Stephen ,                      As a resident of east mckinney and one who loves and serves in this community with our family, we are begging for your help in this decision. We were made aware of this opposed route change that will be severely damaging to one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin county- as this route destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie. It is strongly OPPOSED by Texas parks and Wildlife. If this isn't as important to some, it has worse traffic performance (lower traffic capacity, slower travel speeds, and more elevation changes). Please! oppose Segment C and make Segment D the preferred route. Thank you for your time and help.</p> <p>IN HIM-                      LAUREN LANDMARK</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1283	2/21/2023	Lauren Shadle	Online	<p>I would like to be in support of D. The tranquil barn Tara Royal that I stable my horse at is in peril of having route C placed in front of it. This would not be suitable for the horses or the hands that stay on property to take care of them. Please reconsider route D.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1284	3/10/2023	Lauren Shadle	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, This plight is to convince TXDOT to route the bypass back to plan D instead of Route C (which would run along the top of my driveway where my horse is stabled and I ride regularly. 29 ranch residences & 15 businesses will be adversely affected by Route C while a handful of small structures would be affected by Route D as it is in the flood plain along Woodlawn. Please choose route D. Thank you, Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.
1285	2/17/2023	Lauren Vanderbilt	Email	As a concerned citizen amd as stated in the subject line, I am writing to STRONGLY oppose Route C and give my support of Route D for the 380 bypass in McKinney. Route C will unnecessarily destroy so much land and property that is used for so much good in the area. PLEASE go with Route D. Lauren Vanderbilt	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1286	4/20/2023	Laurie and Jim Taylor	Email	To whom it may concern: No one has consistently explained why Segment B wasn't selected over A. As a person with autoimmune diseases, as well as my children, I am extremely concerned for my safety, health and well being during a very long construction process, the negative environmental impact it will have on me and my family and the limited ability to enter and exit my subdivision(Tucker Hill)... ambulances, firetrucks and police services, etc. Dangerous air pollution and noise pollution will greatly affect all of us in The Tucker Hill community. I will not be able to enjoy and use my home(indoor and outdoor) as our overall neighborhood design was intended... a front porch community. Very sad the politics of Manegate is involved in this decision. Concerns of continuous negative changes and encroachments toward the Tucker Hill neighborhood. Total disregard of tax payer money...irresponsible.  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
1287	4/17/2023 4/19/2023	Laurie L. Smith	Email (2)	Dear Mr. Endres and TXDOT: As a McKinney citizen I understand that a bypass may be required to support growth in the northern corridor. However, in selecting Segment A for the 380 bypass, TxDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents and will demonstrate significant fiscal irresponsibility. This decision is made more egregious with the existence of a viable lower impact alternative. It appears irrefutable that Segment B is the better alternative and that there are serious flaws in the conclusions reached by TxDOT and in the underlying Environmental Impact Study (EIS).  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1288	4/20/2023	Laurie S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Section A has far greater impact in all matters: economically, environmentally, noise and safety. I support B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
1289	4/20/2023	Laurie S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Route A! It's alarmingly more expensive and encroaches on long existing McKinney neighborhoods.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1290	4/17/2023	Laurie Sweet	Email	<p>I am a resident of McKinney, Tx and a homeowner in Tucker Hill Development. I want to strongly SUPPORT segment B of the proposed 380 expansion. As a resident of TH we only have 2 exits from our neighborhood, both out to 380. Any construction for 3-5 years in front of our neighborhood would severely impact our safety. What safeguards will be implemented should you proceed with A for our community during construction? Emergency vehicle response times would be greatly increased. This also would continue based on your drawing of what segment A would look like as any emergency vehicle coming from the west would have to go beyond TH and if we had to go east to Baylor hospital we would have to head west first. How is TxDOT going to address this issue also during the construction phase? We have been hearing for 7 years that Stonebridge is going to be extended but still has not so no guarantees that it will be prior to construction. Is this something TxDOT will take a proactive approach on?</p> <p>Further, your own matrix shows the number of businesses, residents, and other displacements to be less with B. Cost is much less, nearly \$150m, with your current estimates with B. You even state it could go higher with the utility re-routing. Environmental impact is even less with option B. Segment A could have a potential high-risk EPA clean up where B has zero. These are all things from your own study. There are numerous other issues and questions with regard to the study used to base your decision. I have attached a copy of all issues and supported references.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What study has TxDOT done to show the full impact of air quality both during and after construction?</li> <li>2) Where were those monitors located?</li> <li>3) What dates and times were collected during this study?</li> <li>4) What list of assumptions did TxDOT use in regards to weather etc during this study?</li> <li>5) Please answer the same questions above for the sound study that was done in Tucker Hill.</li> <li>6) Why are there no plans to put up sound barriers on the north side (Tucker Hill) but on the south side (Stonebridge)? Prevailing winds are from the south and we would be affected most.</li> <li>7) Segment A consists of 2 90 degree turns. What studies have been done on the safety of those as compared to the gradual lane shift in B?</li> </ol> <p>Laurie Sweet 7604 Townsend Blvd McKinney, Tx 75071</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1291	3/13/2023	Laurie Taylor	Email	I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period. We need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. Thank you, Laurie Taylor "Finally, brothers and sisters, whatever is true, whatever is noble, whatever is right , whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is admirable- if anything is excellent or praiseworthy- think about such things. Whatever you have learned or received or heard from me, or seen in me- put into practice. And the God of peace will be with you." Philippians 4:8-9	This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.  Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1292	4/20/2023	Lauta A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1293	4/20/2023	Lawrence K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A:Yes to segment to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1294	3/10/2023	Leah Caputo	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Leah Caputo	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
1295	2/16/2023	Leanne Bishop	Paper form	Send copy of 5764 CR 123 Plot	All information and exhibits shown at the Public Hearing are also available on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1296	3/14/2023	Lee Ingram	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Lee Ingram 1504 Roxboro Ln McKinney, TX 75071 214-995-0614	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1297	4/20/2023	Lee M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please reconsider and select route B. Taxpayers money will be wasted on route A.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1298	3/29/2023	Leena Mirza	Online	We would not have purchased the property had we known. Really against the idea of emission, noise and disrupt of the nature that we have and reason for purchasing the property. My family and I can't express enough concern for this highway and how much we are against it. Despite all videos and everything we are completely AGAINST this highway. It would be a true disappointment if our voices are not heard. Having a highway this close to homes is a big NO NO! Texas has enough land to build highways and homes away from one another! Where did the city fall short?	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. Public input is an important factor but it is not the only factor that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS. No final decision regarding an alignment will be made until TxDOT reviews and considers all timely public input.  TxDOT, at its sole discretion, will make the final selection of an alignment for the project in the Record of Decision.
1299	3/16/2023	Lee-Yen Elliott	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1300	3/7/2023	Leigh Taylor	Open Records Request	My personal Comments to TXDOT about route A & B for the 380 Bypass comments. I live at 2116 Tremont Blvd, McKinney, TX 75071	Comments submitted for the US 380 public scoping meeting and feasibility study public meetings are available on TxDOT's website. The meeting summaries including comment responses are available at the below link: <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-environmental-impact-statement-from-coit-road-to-fm-1827">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-environmental-impact-statement-from-coit-road-to-fm-1827</a>
1301	3/21/2023	Leigh Taylor	Email	Hi Stephen, I live in Tucker Hill and wanted to know how I find out when the Noise pollution studies were conducted? What SPL meter was used? LEQA was over what period of time and what time of day? Or, were these computer calculated projections? These are things I'm not finding in the study. Thanks so much for your time! Leigh Taylor 2116 Tremont Blvd McKinney, TX 75071	The existing noise measurements were collected on December 14 and 16, 2021. The Noise Study was completed in November 2022.  The sound level meter used for field measurements was a Larson Davis 824 (Type 1 precision integrating sound level meter) with a Larson Davis microphone/preamp and calibrator.  The field measurements were collected on December 14, 2021 for a 30 minute time period from 11:26 am through 11:55 am.  Noise measurements are performed as part of the validation study. A validation study is performed in order to verify that the existing Traffic Noise Model accurately predicts existing traffic noise based on current conditions and to ensure that traffic noise is the main source of noise. Model validation compares field-collected sound level measurements to traffic noise levels calculated in an existing condition model that used field-collected traffic parameters. The Existing Noise Validation Study is located in Appendix C (p. 427) of the Noise Report. The field measurement identification for the Tucker Hill neighborhood is ML-5 (p. 447).
1302	4/19/2023	Leigh Taylor	Email	To Whom it may concern, Please add these comments to my previous questions and comments. Thank you! As a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer, I believe that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of political maneuvering, lobbying/campaigning, and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait that ostensibly has swayed TxDOT's position, and I publicly condemn these actions as unethical and improper. The preferred segment should be chosen based on the facts and what the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) requires. Per CEQ(2021), decisions on an alignment must be based on what is practical and feasible from a technical and economic standpoint, rather than what is desirable from the standpoint of the agency (i.e, TxDOT). As a McKinney homeowner, I believe a bypass may be required to support growth in the northern corridor. However, in selecting Segment A for the 380 bypass, TxDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents and will demonstrate significant fiscal irresponsibility. This decision is made more egregious with the existence of a viable lower-impact alternative. It appears irrefutable that Segment B, or an unexplored	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.  Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>West of Custer Rd. alternative is the better alternative, and that there are some serious flaws in the conclusions reached by TxDOT and in the underlying Environmental Impact Study (EIS). Please do not proceed with this project without a rigorous study of all pollutants that cause harm to humans and a rigorous health impact analysis to understand both current and future impacts. If TxDOT will not mitigate these harms, then TxDOT should at the very least do a rigorous analysis of these harms and explicitly note the opportunities we forgo with the currently preferred alignment. The pollution appendices are missing critical analyses and portions. This project should not proceed until those egregious omissions and errors are corrected. In order to ensure resolution and the creation of the best project possible, we request that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●TxDOT issue a second draft of the EIS to correct significant deficiencies in the current draft EIS.</li> <li>●Any Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) have a 90-day review period, with an official public comment period, and that the FEIS be unbundled from the Record of Decision</li> </ul> <p>Also, I believe the Noise study that was conducted for Tucker Hill was flawed and biased. The importance of this is underscored by the existing scientific literature showing the association between traffic and related noise on physical and mental health. There is data showing that a home near noisy highways affects the sleep cycles of residents, which in turn affects their overall health. The organ most affected is the heart which leads to a shorter lifespan. There is also a ton of data that shows excess noise is the leading cause of tinnitus, an epidemic in our society. The study evaluated only a single barrier south of the community. It appears the study was biased toward providing more data around Main Gait, a facility with transient guests, thenTuckerHill, a community of over380 homes with plans for over 600. Additionally, it appears that there has been no regard taken to Tucker Hill's numerous veteran residents, elderly residents, or our residents with disabilities—collectively, who likely outnumber MainGait's transient guests. I have two children diagnosed with sensory issues and without any noise abatement as proposed by TXDot, they will most definitely be affected. Regarding the noise study, I have the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why was only one data point used to collect the decibel level?</li> <li>2. Why was this time chosen, before Noon, during a time when many cars were not on the streets?</li> <li>3. When the decibel data was collected, had traffic patterns returned to normal "Pre-Covid" levels?</li> <li>4. Why was that date for decibel measurement chosen, given that it was not at all a typical traffic time?</li> <li>5. Will there be more decibel measurements during normal high-traffic times, to make sure you are accurate with your decibel increases if this 380 bypass is placed where TXDot is preferring it be placed?</li> <li>6. Have you considered the decibel measurements from other similar depressed hwy. areas, like that in Frisco, across from Scottish Rite Hospital? When I went to go take measurements, the decibels went well</li> </ol>	<p>State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>After reviewing Public Hearing comments as well as completing the schematic design and technical analyses, TxDOT will issue an FEIS. The Notice of Availability of the FEIS-ROD will be posted to the TxDOT website, advertised in a local newspaper, sent to property owners within a half mile of the project, and those that have signed up to receive email updates. No comment period will be held for the FEIS-ROD.</p> <p>The traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines. Sound levels were forecasted utilizing the required Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) computer program, Traffic Noise Model 2.5 (TNM). Noise modeling inputs include the roadway geometry, forecasted traffic volumes, adjacent land uses and developments, and neighboring receptors. The model accuracy is contingent upon computed sound levels that are within 3 dB of those taken at ambient measurement points adjacent to the project. The ambient sound measurements are used to validate the model and not to determine present-day or future conditions. The validated model was used to compute sound levels for two scenarios, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- existing – representing the existing roadway alignment and profile in the present-day acoustic environment;</li> <li>- future build condition – representing the proposed roadway improvements in the design year acoustic environment.</li> </ul> <p>TxDOT's Traffic Noise Policy Implementation Guidance states "Input data for traffic noise modeling such as traffic volumes, traffic speed, and vehicle mix must represent the traffic characteristics that yield the loudest hourly traffic noise levels on a regular basis under normal conditions. Note that in heavily congested urban corridors, the peak traffic period may not represent the worst noise conditions, since speeds may be lower and heavy truck volumes may drop as truckers try to avoid congestion."</p> <p>Input for each scenario consisted of worst-case traffic projections provided by TxDOT.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>above the data that was in the Noise study.                      7. Why is an increase of 40% to 50% in decibels, okay for a front porch community filled with people of various ages, disabilities and sensory issues? What data do have supporting that this will not negatively affect our health and our mental health?                      8. Why was there no data on what the Noise or pollution will be like during the construction phase?                      9. Why was there no data on what the noise will be like from the shift WEST of the proposed route?                      10. Will there be a noise study done to see how this shift will affect the homes off of Grassmere, the park area, the dog park area and the future proposed walking trails in the community when it is built out?                      I would like to also go on record, that the shift WEST, away from Billingsly property, should be moved back to where it was planned originally. This, RAISED hwy bypass will most definitely affect the residents of Tucker Hill and there are zero studies on this. You cannot just move a highway closer to residents, without conducting any research on how this will affect their mental and physical help. I would urge TXDot to do more research on the effects of these increases in noise. We are not talking about a minor increase, we are talking about a percentage. 4 dbl increase, is a 40% increase in noise. 5 dbl is a 50% increase in noise. When you consider the mental health crisis in this country and are now informed that noise pollution is a large contributor to mental health issues, you should at the very least, place sound barriers and help with other noise-mitigating processes. Tucker Hill is a "front porch" community and every home is designed with a front porch that encourages outdoor activities and interactions between neighbors. The noise study itself appeared to use an outdated data program that has been updated to help correct the flaws that can be found within the version of the program used. Why wasn't a more updated program used for noise data collection? Why was it acceptable to use an outdated version? Tucker Hill has been designed in a way to help fight against mental health issues, by encouraging outdoor living and engaging with their neighbors on daily basis. It is truly a unique place within McKinney and you will be destroying the very things that communities should be doing to help us fight against our mental and physical health crisis in this country. Healthy living and healthy minds are what can be found in the way Tucker Hill is built and hope to be further developed. TXDot needs to consider this and abandon their plans to build Route A. TxDot, at the very least, needs to help encourage this type of community and not negatively affect it. Thank you for your time, recording my comments and considering my questions.                      Leigh Taylor                      2116 Tremont Blvd                      McKinney, TX 75071                      Leigh Taylor                      818-481-4449  <a href="http://www.defactosound.com">www.defactosound.com</a>  <a href="http://www.20k.org">www.20k.org</a></p>	<p>proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>The Segment A shift that was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1303	3/6/2023	Leigh Wilcox	Email	<p>Good Morning,                      I'm writing to express my sincere concern over plans for the 380 bypass. Plan C would negatively affect far more residences, businesses and wildlife than would Plan D. Plan C would divide residential and farming/ranching communities, greatly disrupting their functions. Plan C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife because it would eliminate a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species. Please help protect the residences, businesses and wildlife that currently exist along Plan C and help push for the Plan D instead. Sincerely,                      ~Leigh Wilcox                      Collin County Resident</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1304	3/24/2023	Leigh Wilcox	Email	<p>Dear Senator Paxton, Representative Leach, and Mr. Endres:  I am writing to inform you that as a resident of Collin County and frequent driver on Highway 380, I strongly oppose Segment C and support Segment D. Segment D would have lower environmental impact and fewer homes, businesses, and community services would be affected. Sincerely,  ~Leigh Wilcox  Collin County Resident  Please excuse any typos - Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p>
1305	4/20/2023	LeighAnn W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>"option" A makes no sense at all being so insanely more expensive than B and the number of homes and businesses it will destroy and displace.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition to Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1306	2/27/2023	Leland R. Caldwell	Email	<p>Mr. Khoshkar, I am D.L. Caldwell's brother, Leland. D. L. and I came out to your office for a couple of minutes this past Friday. It was nice meeting you and I am following up with sending you an attachment which shows the one map we would like to get the more detailed version of. It is the one that Txdot had on display at the most recent meeting at the Collin County Courthouse. It is the last map from Segment C. Could you please have someone send us a copy of the map where Segment C comes in at US Hwy 380? The map that was being displayed had a more refined version in the right hand upper corner and illustrated that the initial map showing kind of a cul-de-sac there on the South side of 380 at FM 1827 has been refined somewhat and does not include a cul-de-sac there. We do not really care one way or another, but we are trying to begin planning for the future in that area and D.L. owns a couple of structures on the Northeast corner of that location. The structures previously belonged to a Mr. Billy Carroll and Texdot already purchased the frontage and house there and has already torn the house down. D.L. now owns the remaining portion of the property that Mr. Carroll owned previously. We understand the precise route at the location has not yet been determined the and the maps only represent preferred routes, alternatives, and some refinements of those. We understand any map sent to us is subject to change. Thank you so much. Kind regards, Leland R. Caldwell Attorney at Law Visiting Magistrate Judge Texas Bar Number: 00797814 Office Number: 972-369-7979 [REDACTED] 3067 CR 330 McKinney, Texas 75071</p>	Your comment is noted and map received. All materials shown at the Public Hearing, including the schematic roll plots, are available at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1307	3/10/2023	Lelia Reposa	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1308	3/16/2023	Leonard Kilby	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1309	2/16/2023	Lesley Wesiruay	Paper form	<p>Segment C is horrid in so many ways. DO NOT construct C! I suggest finishing 380, maybe a double decker hwy like 35 in Austin. Planning ahead could also help... ie, build the roads before building infrastructure</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. Double decked (or elevated) freeway sections were considered during the Feasibility Study. It will not be further considered for the corridor because it would not substantially reduce the amount of right-of-way needed to construct the roadway, and it would be more expensive. It's important to note that TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove elevated freeways in several locations across the state, including I-35 in downtown Austin.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1310	3/12/2023	Leslie Allcorn	Online	<p>I am reaching out to express my opposition to the 380 segment A. I am a resident of Tucker Hill and I am passionate about keeping the charm and architectural beauty of this statement neighborhood of McKinney. It is the embodiment of the "Unique by Nature" slogan that McKinney touts. Segment B is much less expensive and invasive. The city of Prosper created a loud voice against segment B without knowing the true facts about costs and the loss of businesses that are easily relocated. Tucker Hill is a hidden gem whose voice is considered the underdog. Please help preserve our wonderful wildlife ( like our resident roadrunners) , our noise levels and our air quality. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration</p> <p>Leslie Allcorn 7312 Ripley St</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).</p> <p>TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>
1311	3/13/2023	Leslie Allcorn	Email	<p>I would like to formally request an extension to the comment period because more time is needed to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill and it's surrounding neighbors and businesses from the more expensive and intrusive Option A.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration</p> <p>Leslie Allcorn 7312 Ripley Street</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1312	4/19/2023	Leslie Allcorn	Email	<p>To Whom it may Concern;            We are residents of Tucker Hill and have great concerns about Segment A. I am confused by the inconsistencies with the choices of segments. It was stated in the choice between C and D that the choice was made to affect fewer homes. However, Segment A affects more homes than Segment B. Please explain. Also, I'm not happy about the irresponsibility of spending at least \$200 million more for Segment A. It makes no common sense. My husband and I chose Tucker Hill because of its unique charm and front porch living. Noise and air quality threaten to steal that from us. Please read the attached PDF for more detailed reasonings. I urge you to choose Segment B based on common sense and responsible spending.            Respectfully,            Leslie Allcorn</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
1313	2/22/2023	Leslie Jean	Online	<p>Need Sound Barriers Junction of Roll 4 and Roll 5, The freeway is too close to many homes on corner of Ridge Road / Bloomdale Road. The houses will be surrounded by the freeway on 2 sides. There is a danger of the freeway of bring much crime to our neighborhoods. Studies have shown that crimes including Drug Trafficking and Human Trafficking happen on main freeways. Among many other crimes. This is a major concern.</p>	<p>Your comment and concerns about traffic noise and crime is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Heatherwood neighborhood currently has a brick privacy wall or barrier of some type that would reduce noise, therefore making the area unable to meet feasibility and reasonableness requirements.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1314	1/25/2023	Leslie Jean	Online	<p>The proposed 380 Freeway is Dangerously too close to New homes this is not feasible, or a good idea! The 380 needs to stay on the 380. I just bought a new home in Bloomridge. I bought it and spent a lot of money and was never told about this proposal. I want a quiet safe home for my family. Thank you Leslie Jean</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Improvements to US 380 have been under consideration since 2016. Multiple Public Meetings with concurrent public comment periods were held during the feasibility study, as well as during the EIS phase.</p> <p>The Green Alternative, or Segment F, from Coit Road to FM 1827 (also referred to as "keeping 380 on 380" or expanding the existing US 380 to a freeway), was identified during the Feasibility Study, but ultimately was not carried forward for further analysis after because it would have displaced more than 30 residents and 200 businesses including Raytheon.</p>
1315	3/15/2023	Leticia Salam	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• Destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>• Disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• Eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/ threatened species.</li> <li>• Affects and displaces 383% more homes (29 vs. 6), 300% more businesses (16 vs. 4), and more community resources.</li> <li>• Strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.
1316	4/4/2023	Liang Chen	Online	I live in Willow Wood neighborhood. Looking at the schematics, I didn't find any connection between US 75 and SH 5 utilizing the DCs between US 75 and US 380. A large amount of traffic on SH 5 need to get on US 75 and the current configuration doesn't seem to support that movement. Would you able to fit in ramps provide those connections? Please refer to image attached. Thanks!	US 75 and SH 5 are too close together to utilize direct connectors to provide access between the two roads. In addition to the US 380 frontage roads, local streets are maintained to provide access between US 75 and SH 5, such as FM 195/Laud Howell Parkway and Bloomdale Road.
1317	4/4/2023	Liang Chen	Online	AADTs on mainlanes on from US 75 to FM 1827 range from 43,000 to 50,000 vpd in year 2050, and based on the 8.5% K factors adopted in Appendix I - Traffic Data, the peak hour volume would roughly be from 3,655 to 4,250 vph. If you add 9,000 vpd in each direction on FRs, you peak hour volume would be about 4,420 to 5,015 vph. These volumes do not justify at least 3 freeway lanes and 2 FR lanes in each direction. It seems that 6 lane cross-section freeway would be sufficient for the volume projected. Given that a large portion of Seg C and Seg D will traverse floodplains and agricultural land, FRs and Texas U-turn interchanges seem unnecessary and might have more harm done to the local environment. I don't see any needs for FRs between SH 5 and FM 1827. Please look into alternatives reducing pavements and bridges. Thanks!	TxDOT aims to plan for 2050 and beyond. The projected traffic volumes are well beyond the capacity of a six-lane arterial. TxDOT provides continuous frontage roads for incident management on the mainlanes in addition to local access to properties.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1318	4/4/2023	Liang Chen	Online	<p>One of the objectives of this project is to reduce the flow of traffic on current US 380 and improve safety. It seems that the proposed US 380 freeway did provide extra capacity for east-west movement, but the situation on current US 380 will not improve based on traffic projection data. See image below of existing US 380 projection at Hardin Blvd (Taken from DEIS Appendix I, Gold Alternative, Sheet 48 of 61). The AADT projected west of Hardin Blvd will still be closed 50,000 vpd. And if you look at the count stations on US 380 near that location, it is about 52,000 vpd in 2019. Everyone along that corridor knows that currently it is very congested with this level of traffic. Other locations are better than at Hardin, but you will find that the traffic on US 380 will grow back to its current level near 50,000 vpd between Ridge Rd and US 75 sometime between 2030 to 2050. (Text limitation. Please see attached word document)</p> <p>The shift doesn't seem that effective in re-routing traffic given that there are many establishments and neighborhoods along US 380. Before you could reach year 2050, the current US 380 will revert back to what it is today without much improvement on local traffic nor on safety. Google map shows that using the current US 380, it will take 16 minutes minimum to travel between project limits. I will assume the free flow travel time is about 16 minutes. From the public meeting material, the preferred alternative (Seg A-E-C) will be about 15.8 miles and with a free flow travel speed of 75 mph, it will take about 13 minutes to travel between limits. During off-peak periods, this improvement in travel time does not seem that appealing. Also, the total bridge length for the preferred alternative (Seg A-E-C) is 22.92 miles according to the provided material. I am surprised that the elevated freeway alternative was never mentioned in the feasibility study and in alternative study. The total length of the US 380 is 11.2 miles, and if you could fit piers on existing ROW, the total bridge length may be about 22 miles or less considering you could expand ROW and build at-grade in some segments.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Latent demand exists along US 380 today and will decrease once this US 380 freeway project is built. The existing US 380 will also fill with traffic as the population continues to grow in the future.</p> <p>Your analysis compares present day no-build traffic (current US 380) to future build traffic (current US 380 and this project). It does not take into consideration the increase in delay if the project was not built, which will be significantly worse.</p> <p>Double decked (or elevated) freeway sections were considered during the Feasibility Study. It will not be further considered for the corridor because it would not substantially reduce the amount of right-of-way needed to construct the roadway, and it would be more expensive. It's important to note that TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove elevated freeways in several locations across the state, including I-35 in downtown Austin.</p>
1319		Lidia Velz	Comment Form	<p>We need a sound barrier you are destroying our way of life. The least you can do is protect us from the noise. Our home has a red dot on top, it will be affected but no wall is program.</p>	<p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. More information about the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in section 3.14.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1320	3/16/2023	Ligia Villanueva	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1321	2/23/2023	Lillie Miller	Comment Form	Please consider the switch from D segment to C segment. Section C is too environmentally important, disrupts too many home and businesses. There are important businesses that will be displaced. A lot of people are very upset about the sudden switch to C. Please consider how many people and significant wildlife areas that will be hurt, displaced, damaged or destroyed by C.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1322	3/8/2023	Linda A. Generazio	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Linda A. Generazio	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1323	4/20/2023	Linda B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option B is less costly and better for quality of life!!!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1324	4/20/2023	Linda Beene	Email	As senior citizens in Tucker Hill, I am very concerned about the ingress/egress during the construction phase. Please provide a specific description of how the entrances to the neighborhood would be managed. Surely there will be two entrances at all times for emergency vehicles.  Please provide more detailed information about your noise study. We have lived in McKinney nearly 30 years. Previous to our home in Tucker Hill, we lived in Eldorado, about ½ mile west of Highway 75. At all times the noise from the highway could be heard, and sometimes at high levels! For the noise summary you presented for this project, was your testing also done during peak traffic hours? On cloudy days? For an elevated road? For 8 lanes of traffic? We are VERY concerned about the new noise level being	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.  The traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines. Sound levels were forecasted utilizing the required Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) computer program, Traffic Noise Model 2.5 (TNM). Model inputs include roadway geometry, traffic forecasts, anticipated travel speeds, and adjacent land uses and developments.  Ambient noise measurements were collected on December 14 and 16,

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>much higher than from your initial study. 98% of the homes in Tucker Hill have front porches, so that there is an excellent feel of “community”. We did not have this in Eldorado, so outdoor visiting wasn’t as important. In Tucker Hill, the new noise level may destroy this community feeling.</p> <p>I have learned that the original highway layout (as it turned north) was moved further west so that the elevated freeway would be closer to Tucker Hill. Given that the new development has NO homeowners yet, why would it be given preferential treatment over the existing homeowners in Tucker Hill?</p> <p>Finally, please let me know why ManeGait played such an important role in your decision of A over B. From my perspective (and I am a donor to and big proponent of ManeGait), that facility could easily be moved slightly if needed, so that option B could be implemented. Option B would not affect a full subdivision of existing homeowners (Tucker Hill).</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, and taking the time to read this. Linda Beene 469-450-8056</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>2021. The Noise Study was completed in November 2022. The sound level meter used for ambient measurements was a Larson Davis 824 (Type 1 precision integrating sound level meter) with a Larson Davis microphone/preamp and calibrator. The ambient measurements were collected on December 14, 2021, during a 30-minute time period from 11:26 am through 11:55 am. The ambient measurements are used for model validation and calibration; not to establish existing or future noise levels. A validation study is performed in order to verify that the existing Traffic Noise Model accurately predicts existing traffic noise based on current conditions and to ensure that traffic noise is the main source of noise. Model validation compares field-collected sound level measurements to traffic noise levels calculated in an existing condition model that used field-collected traffic parameters. The Existing Model Validation Study is Appendix C (p. 427) of the Traffic Noise Analysis Report in Appendix R of the DEIS. The field measurement identification for the Tucker Hill neighborhood is ML-5 (p. 447).</p> <p>TxDOT's Traffic Noise Policy Implementation Guidance states "Input data for traffic noise modeling such as traffic volumes, traffic speed, and vehicle mix must represent the traffic characteristics that yield the loudest hourly traffic noise levels on a regular basis under normal conditions. Note that in heavily congested urban corridors, the peak traffic period may not represent the worst noise conditions, since speeds may be lower and heavy truck volumes may drop as truckers try to avoid congestion."</p> <p>TxDOT is evaluating the impacts of the shift in Segment A presented as an alternate design at the Public Hearing. It did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The proposed right-of-way was shifted along the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>By far the issue that TxDOT has heard about the most from the public and stakeholders on the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study and this EIS project has been direct and indirect impacts to ManeGait. Based on that, it was one of the many things that TxDOT considered. The numerous other considerations can be found on the Segment Analysis Matrix. <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1325	3/13/2023	Linda Clough	Email	Good afternoon, I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to assess the impact and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill, as well as, other neighborhoods and businesses affected by Segment A. Linda Clough 7312 Easley Dr McKinney, TX 75071	This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.  Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1326	4/2/2023	Linda Clough	Online	Your selection of Segment A is a decision not supported by the facts. I am opposed to Segment A and support Segment B. Three of the four reasons given to support the decision to select Segment C are: Impacts fewer utilities Costs is less Minimizes impact to floodplains and flood ways. Applying this same criteria to A vs B would conclude B is preferred. Looks like the criteria was selected to support the conclusion you wanted not an impartial decision based on the facts.	Your comment, support of Segment B and opposition of Segment A is noted. The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.  Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.  For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1327	4/18/2023	Linda Clough	Online	Attachment April 18, 2023 To whom it may concern: As a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer, I find that TxDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of political maneuvering, campaigning, and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait that ostensibly has swayed TxDOT's position, and I publicly condemn these actions as unethical and improper.  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Per the Segment Analysis Matrix, the same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1328	2/17/2023	Linda Cochran	Online	Yes we are encouraged that the proposal is to keep the 380 on the 380 through Prosper. Please keep the 380 where it is through the town of Prosper. Thank you	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1329	3/15/2023	Linda Louise White De Mattei	Email	US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 DEIS and Public Hearing Comment Hello, I would like to express my support for the " Blue Alignment" as shown on the latest DEIS at it adequately addresses the environmental, social and engineering requirements of the project. Sincerely, Linda Louise White De Mattei 300 Yosemite Drive Prosper, TX 75078-9071	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1330	4/20/2023	Linda W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Use Segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1331	4/20/2023	Lindsay B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A and yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1332	3/9/2023	Lindsay Hines	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1333	4/20/2023	Lindsay R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1334	3/7/2023	Lindsay Rose	Email	<p>Mr Stephen Endres TX DoT Good afternoon As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost approximately \$69 million less, reduce the unplanned tax burden on McKinney residents, will not destroy 27 businesses and 2 homes. Segment A is not only financially irresponsible but it hurts the 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely Lindsay Rose Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1335	3/16/2023	Lindsey Denne	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1336	3/28/2023	Lindy Cowan	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Lindy Cowan</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1337	4/20/2023	Linell F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>YES to Segment B</p>	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1338	4/20/2023	Linzee R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I writing to advocate for Segment B over Segment A. Segment B will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1339	3/1/2023	Lisa Bradley	Email	I am adamantly opposed to option A. Lisa Bradley 7804 Purple Martin Way McKinney	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1340	3/16/2023	Lisa Kelly	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Lisa Kelly	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1341	4/20/2023	Lisa P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A. Yes to B !!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1342	4/20/2023	Lisa P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1343	4/20/2023	Lisa Q	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1344	3/10/2023	Lisa Quartararo	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you! Lisa Quartararo Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1345	2/11/2023	Liz Cena	Email	Please support Route D as a better choice for the highway ROW because it doesn't disturb as much wetland and forest and disrupts far fewer homes and businesses.	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted. Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.  According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.
1346	2/24/2023 3/9/2023	Liz Warren	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Warm Regards, Liz Warren, PhD Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S22 Ultra 5G, an AT&T 5G smartphone Get Outlook for Android	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1347	3/15/2023	Logan Schultz	Online	The segment analysis matrix does not specify the difference in "Improve Safety" between the different segments. Specifically, when looking at the difference between Segment A and Segment B, there is a big difference in the curvature of the road. Two almost 90 degree turns (such as the one I marked on the map) will have a significant impact on the costs - especially from accidents - between those two segments, but it is not clear where in your analysis that comparison was taken into account. Every big significant curve like that in Segment A will have significant traffic issues / accidents much more consistently than a straighter, more gentle curve. For example, the US 121 around DFW often has backups from an accident or people slowing down due to the curve. The Capital Beltway around DC is another good example. I just want to ensure/understand how that was taken into account. Thank you for your consideration and for all the hard work you and your team are doing. Logan Schultz	Your comment is noted. The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.
1348	3/7/2023	Lois Hanson	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Colt Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Lois Hanson Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1349	4/20/2023	Lola R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please section b!!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1350	3/16/2023	Lorena Torres	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1351	4/20/2023	Lori B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please consider segment B, not A	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1352	4/20/2023	Lori H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A - YES TO SEGMENT B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1353	3/29/2023	Lori L. Ellis	Email	<p>I am respectfully asking you to revert TXDOT's bypass segment choice from C to D, and preserve our truly unique and beautiful area of forest and farm community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C destroys far more forest, woodlands, grasslands, and prairie.</li> <li>• C affects and displaces many more homes, businesses, and community resources.</li> <li>• C negatively impacts the wetland that serves as a refuge for such species as river otters, beavers, migratory birds and more.</li> <li>• C will divide this special residential and farming/ranching community.</li> </ul> <p>We would greatly appreciate your voicing opposition to Segment C and supporting D. Sincerely, Lori L. Ellis</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p>
1354	2/17/2023	Lori Smeby	Online	I would like more information on the sound mitigation occurring on Segment E south of the Erwin Park area that affects the Timber Creek subdivision. While my property does not directly border the project, I am less than .3 miles and am extremely concerned for the noise impact. I have reviewed the noise abatement strategies offered at this meeting. I respectfully request at minimum a call to understand further the impact to what is currently a 2 year old home and to understand how to request additional abatement. Thank you.	Your comment and concern about traffic noise is noted. A noise barrier was proposed along the freeway to the north of the Timber Creek subdivision in the DEIS. See Figure E-10 on page 128 of Appendix R. In addition to Appendix R, more information about the traffic noise analysis can be found in section 3.14 of the DEIS.
1355	2/17/2023	Lori Snyder	Email	Mr. Endres, I am a long time resident of Collin County and I oppose route C and the bypass in McKinney all together but I'm sure the TXdot will go ahead with something because they care nothing about the residents of this area, their homes, their livelihoods, wildlife or the forests and woodlands. I OPPOSE ROUTE C , the FM2933 portion and #416 & #420. Sincerely, Lori Snyder	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1356	2/17/2023	Lori Swim	Online	<p>Hello My name is Lori Swim I live at 2280 CR 338 Mckinney TX 75071. I oppose segment C. You will be damaging one of the largest remaining forests in central collin county. you will destroy 71% more acres of forests and woodlands. You will destroy our horse and animal rescue. You will take away from children with disabilities by disrupting our open and free property to come to. You will be destroying a home on our property which daughter and grandchild live in. You will be destroying barn with living quarters. You will be destroying our hay field, and eliminate acres for our rescue horses to run. Most importantly you will be destroying our family legacy. I have put my blood sweat and tears into this property along with my husband Mike. We are devastated beyond belief. Please choose another pathway. Thank you, Lori Swim</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1357	2/6/2023	Lori Swim	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1358	3/23/2023	Lorraine Bland	Online	I oppose Segment A Segment B saves over \$150 million dollars for Collin County Taxpayers vs. Segment A \$153M in right of way costs, rather than \$198M in Segment A. \$25M in utility relocation costs, rather than \$75 in Segment A. \$588M in design and construction costs rather than \$608M in Segment A. \$40M savings in utility relocation for the City of McKinney.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B
1359	4/20/2023	Lou P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1360	4/20/2023	Louise B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, Yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1361	2/27/2023	LS	Online	We are encouraged that the EIS recommendation is to Keep 380 on 380 through Prosper! Prosper is a committed regional transportation partner and we have done our best to plan for this expansion on it's current path through town. Keep 380 on 380!	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1362	4/20/2023	Lucinda K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	B	Your comment is noted.
1363	4/20/2023	Lucinda P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1364	3/28/2023	Lucinda Schnitker	Email	No to segment A. It is too close to my home in Stonebridge! Thank you Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1365	3/16/2023	Lucy Duray	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1366	3/6/2023	Lydia DSouza	Online	We live in Stonebridge Ranch called Kensington, directly on 380. The new 380 expansion greatly affects us. Sometimes we cannot get proper sleep at night with constant traffic and enthusiastic speedsters zipping on 380. The proposed sound barrier (Barrier A07-2 in APPENDIX R - Traffic Noise) ends right before the row of houses which are Kensington Village. With this expansion (during and after) Noise will be a nightmare for us added to the constant dust this construction is going to create. Going by the amount of time the expansion happening between FM Rt 720 and DNT (In Denton County) is taking, we can only imagine how long this new expansion in McKinney will take. We strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827 and urge you to implement Segment B. If Segment A does happen, our earnest request to TxDOT is to extend the sound barrier (Barrier A07-2) up to Freedom Drive to shield the row of houses that are part of Stonebridge Ranch.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at the location you mention per TxDOT Guidelines.
1367	3/7/2023 3/8/2023	Lynda Morrison	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Lynda Morrison Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1368	2/6/2023	Lynda Thomas	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1369	4/20/2023	Lynette M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Save stonebridge! No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1370	3/6/2023	Lynette Terrell	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, I support Segment A of the 380 Bypass. I was unable to attend the latest meeting to view the schematics. However, I reviewed your material online and I do have a few concerns about the 380/Custer intersection. It seems that if you are going east on the 380 service road, approaching Custer from the west, in order to continue east to cross Custer, it is necessary to go on the elevated portion of the service road. You can only turn left or right at the intersection. In addition, I haven't figured out how you can exit the Walmart parking lot and have access to the elevated portion of the service road to go east on 380. Also, if you are on Custer, traveling north or south, going under the 380 overpass, you have a crisscross pattern of traffic. This whole intersection just seems unnecessarily complicated for the average driver. The Alternative Plan for the 380/Custer intersection seems much simpler and easier to navigate. I hope you will implement the Alternative Plan. Regards, Lynette Terrell 8564 CR 858 McKinney, TX 75071 (Walnut Grove) 214-491-1833	Your comment, support of Segment A and the traditional interchange design for US 380 and Custer Road is noted. TxDOT continues to work on the design of the interchange taking into account many things such as input from City of McKinney as well as impacts and access to businesses and homes.
1371	2/21/2023	Lynn Kiefer	Email	I understand that changes to 380 are necessary but I request that an alternative be found to Route C. One ranch involved in the Route C option would lose part of their livelihood (the ability to grow grass for hay to feed animals) as well as the ability to continue community use as a galloping trail and lessons for at risk teens (and others). Thank you for reading. Please listen to those who are emailing and show interest at in person meetings and opt for another solution. Sincerely, Myra Lynn Kiefer	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1372	4/6/2023	Lynn Schultz	Email	I am respectfully asking you to change TXDOT's bypass segment choice from C to D, and preserve our truly unique and beautiful area of forest and farm community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C destroys far more forest, woodlands, grasslands, and prairie.</li> <li>• C affects and displaces many more homes, businesses, and community resources.</li> <li>• C negatively impacts the wetland that serves as a refuge for such species as river otters, beavers, migratory birds and more.</li> <li>• C will divide this special residential and farming/ranching community.</li> </ul> We would greatly appreciate your voicing opposition to Segment C and supporting D. Thank you.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p>
1373	2/24/2023	Lynn Swearingen	Email	<p>Good evening,                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.                      Sincerely,                      Lynn Swearingen                      Sent from AT&amp;T Yahoo Mail for iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1374	2/17/2023	Lynne Hascal	Online	We thoroughly oppose the Segment C! My house and property has been there for 56 years. I still live in the same house. We wanted to pass it on to one of our Sons. I grew up in the country, could not even imagine living in the city with a house 10 feet away from mine. We were in the process of planting grapes for a vinyard, already dug the pond and found out about the Catastophe coming directly through our house. We will lose everything we have been building for years. Please come up with a different Route to save our beautiful country side.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1375	4/20/2023	Lynne S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option A doesn't make sense. It disrupts existing businesses and residences vs future development that can be reworked. It takes traffic congestion further east on Hwy 380, and It costs considerably more than Option B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1376	4/20/2023	Lynne W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option B is less expensive and less disruptive. Please consider the many Stonebridge residents' safety and quiet.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1377	4/20/2023	Lynne W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A! Yes to B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1378	3/9/2023	Lynne Weinberger	Email	Thank goodness there's a Plan B! As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Lynne Weinberger Lynne Weinberger [REDACTED] 972.741.8619 Sent from my Smith-Corona - circa 1974.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
1379	2/17/2023	M Adams	Online	I against C. I prefer D.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1380	2/17/2023	M BD	Online	We support keeping 380 on 380 through Prosper	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
1381	3/29/2023	M D	Online	I would prefer this stay on 380, but if not, the A-E-C route makes the most sense as it displaces the fewest number of people, has the least impact on floodplains and does not require taking land from Erwin Park. The more right of way that has to be acquired, the more this project will cost. We should be wise stewards of the budget and choose the route that has the least impact to displacing people and businesses, the environment, or taking land from one of our beautiful parks.	Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.  TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1382	3/16/2023	M Strommer	Online	I am continuing my support for Segment A and my opposition to segment B. As Segment A meets the project needs and purpose. Prosper has continued to plan and build our community with the intention of 380 brewing a freeway and has planned our growth accordingly.	Your comment, support of Segment A, and opposition of Segment B is noted.
1383	3/1/2023	M W	Online	No to segment A. YES to segment B. As a homeowner, I strongly oppose Segment A.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1384	2/22/2023	M. Ramirez	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,                      Good evening. I was unable to make the meeting last night on the proposed frontage bypass for 380 but I would like to voice my support for proposed Route D. Route D disturbs fewer households, which is highly impactful in the current market, and pastureland, some of which houses a community resource for events, recreation, and equine therapy. Route D incorporates flood plain lands that are difficult to develop and at the same time preserves one of the largest forested areas in the county. These green areas are part of what attracts new residents, many of whom are seeking to leave deforested urban areas. Route C not only disturbs more endangered habitats, it negatively impacts 3x more businesses. This, in turn, has strong potential to reduce sales tax revenue on all levels. I appreciate your time and hope that you have a good week. Regards,                      Melissa Ramirez</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p>
1385	2/20/2023	M.H.	Email	<p>Hi, I'm a McKinney resident &amp; I do not support route C of the 380 bypass. Please reconsider</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1386	2/17/2023	M.H.	Online	<p>"I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section DE for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1387	2/17/2023	M.W.	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1388	4/17/2023	Macy Moses	Email	<p>To whom it may concern,  I am a current resident of Tucker Hill. Tucker Hill is a front-porch community, meaning that the majority of us, as residents, spend a lot of time outdoors. I am concerned about how the air quality will be affected by this new bypass. I do not feel this concern was adequately addressed in the study...has TxDOT studied the full impact on air quality both during and after construction? Where were your air quality monitors located in or near our neighborhood, specifically? In addition, I am concerned regarding safety during and after construction. I do NOT feel that this was adequately addressed in the study...specifically how access to our neighborhood will be affected during and after construction. Was the safety of the turns assessed during a comparison of A to B? Ultimately, I strongly object to the proposed shift of the A alignment to the west. This will create a detrimental effect for current and future residents of Tucker Hill. I do not feel that TxDOT has any concern for the well being of the residents of our community. Is it true that TxDOT's own findings concluded that segment B would potentially displace fewer current homes and current businesses than segment A? Is it true that TxDOT's own findings concluded that segment B would have less of an environmental impact than segment A? Is it also true that TxDOT's own findings concluded that segment B would be significantly less expensive to construct than segment A? Therefore, is it true that TxDOT concluded that segment A was the preferred route option even though this decision is in direct conflict with many of your own findings? Sincerely,  Macy Moses</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A and the Segment A shift is noted. The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 TIP. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. The location along study segments with the highest traffic counts (ETC and Design years) were used as the locations for receptors. The receptors are illustrated in Appendix P, CO TAQA Technical Report, Attachment A, Exhibit 3.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>TxDOT is also still evaluating the impacts of the Segment A shift which was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing. It did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. More safety information for each alternative can be found in Figure 2-15 of the DEIS.</p>
1389	2/25/2023	Maddy and Landon Walsh	Email	<p>Comment: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B Dear Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I just don't understand how a proposition that has been thoroughly argued against, destroys a ton of wild life habitats, as well as small businesses and disrupts homes could be picked as the best option. As an educated thinker it does not make any sense and makes me wonder if this was a political decision instead of a decision that has been researched to find the best course of action. Again, as a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Maddy &amp; Landon Walsh</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
1390	1/29/2023 and 1/31/2023	Madeleine G.	Online	<p>No Bypass in Prosper!380 should absolutely not be a limited access highway. There is no benefit to the residents of Prosper. It will do nothing but encourage more thru traffic and make things miserable for residents. Stop trying to force a bypass through already established thriving areas!!</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative. The freeway would stay along the existing US 380 through the Town of Prosper.</p>
1391	4/20/2023	Madhu N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>NO to SEGMENT A</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
1392	2/24/2023	Madhu Nadipelli	Email	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1393	4/20/2023	Madisyn W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1394	4/20/2023	Maek J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, Yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1395	4/20/2023	Maey D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A - Yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1396	2/17/2023	Magan Tyler	Online	Hi, I live at 5101 Pinewood Drive in McKinney, TX 75071 I am commenting to say that our neighborhood and area is very quiet off of Lake Forest. There are not many people who travel that road that do not live in the area. Building the 380 bypass would increase traffic on Lake Forest, especially if Hardin does not connect to the bypass. I am in disagreement that the 380 bypass is built this close to the Heatherwood subdivision – especially without noise retainer walls, which is a must for us. I am suggesting that 380 go further north, such as following the Collin County Outer Loop that is not completed for some reason.	Your comment is noted. It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
1397	2/16/2023	Magan Tyler	Paper form	Would like a copy of section E 380 proposal fir Geatgerwiid HOA (Lake Forest / Bluewood)	All Public Hearing materials including the schematic design plans can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .  The specific roadways you reference can be found on roll plot 9 of 42 on page 10 of Appendix B showing schematics for Segments A, B, and E.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1398	2/16/2023	Magdelen Boyle	Paper form	While I understand the need for progress and keeping up with the growing population, I believe decision should be made that are least disruptive to existing homes and businesses. Preserving forests and woodlands as much as possible is also important. I support Segment D.	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted.
1399	3/28/2023	Major Jordan	Email	I am a Stonebridge resident and I vote NO on the segment A 380 bypass. Major Jordan Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail for iPhone	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1400	2/16/2023	Malcolm Mulroney	Online	Overall the need for road improvements and managed growth is vital to our county. As a land developer I understand tough decisions need to be made, however the decision to select section c vs section d seems wrong. Section C impacts less housing units and uses more of the existing 380 section. both reasons supported for section A,	Your comment is noted.
1401	3/14/2023	Manahil R. Malik	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Manahil R. Malik	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1402	3/13/2023	Maneesh	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1403	2/25/2023	Marc G	Online	Slow down 380, do not make this a faster more dangerous road for residents. The impact of the widen the road goes far beyond the land being purchased. The noise impacts tons of residents of various neighborhoods. The noise impacts need to be considered as part of the decision. The loud noise from 380 will impact home values significantly and will deter people. 380 as a 6 lane road is more than sufficient.	Your comment is noted. The project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points. Furthermore, a new location freeway would likely attract traffic away from the existing US 380, thereby alleviating congestion, and reducing the number of crashes.  A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. For more information on traffic noise, please refer to Section 3.14 of the DEIS.
1404	4/20/2023	Marcia C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1405	4/17/2023	Marcia Carson	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1406	4/20/2023	Marcia S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1407	4/20/2023	Marcia T	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to Segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1408	4/20/2023	Marcie S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1409	2/21/2023	Marcy Schlesinger	Online	This was a huge joke! No live presentation or Q and A. There was no structure to anything. Why bother to hold this meeting when every representative had a different answer to the same questions.	Your comment is noted. Public Hearing notices included information about the open house meeting format.
1410	3/22/2023	Mardie Hinkley	Email	<p>Hello,                      We wish to voice our opposition to segment C on the Blue and Brown alternatives of the 380 Bypass routes. Though this graphic shows the route just touching a corner of our friend's property where my grandnephew and sister keep their bees, it passes very close to or through the homes of several of other neighbors. We could however support segment D on the purple and gold routes. This segment appears to displace fewer homes. <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/0135-02-065%20etc_US380_Roll%20Plot%201.15.2021.pdf">http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/0135-02-065%20etc_US380_Roll %20Plot%201.15.2021.pdf</a>                      Sincerely,                      Mardie Hinkley of Boston MA,                      Sister of Maureen Hinkley of McKinney, TX 75071                      Mardie Hinkley, M.Ed., PMC                      Early Education Entrepreneur, Leader, Advocate &amp; Consultant  <a href="http://www.linkedin.com/in/educationpolicyleadershipmontessorimardiehinkley">www.linkedin.com/in/educationpolicyleadershipmontessorimardiehinkley</a></p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1411	2/6/2023	Margaret and Rebecca Nemeth	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1412	3/29/2023	Margaret Bahe	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Margaret Bahe</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1413	4/20/2023	Margaret D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I strongly oppose Segment A and support Segment B</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1414	2/13/2023	Margaret O'Neal	Email	This is what you're destroying by picking Route C Please choose another way. The picture of the boys is the 5th generation to live on Woodlawn Farm. My grandfather bought our farm in 1952.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1415	4/20/2023	Margie H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please DO NOT select segment A on 380. It displaces more residents and businesses and is more expensive. Please select Segment B. Thank you!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1416	4/20/2023	Margie M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to option A. Option B is more cost effective and better for the community	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1417	3/7/2023	Margie Wilkes	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Margie Wilkes Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1418	3/28/2023	Margo Lerner	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Margo Lerner 7417 Nabors Lane McKinney, TX 75071 972-213-6110 Resident of McKinney since 2004	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1419	2/17/2023	Maria King	Online	Just say NO to the 380 bypass!!! This is a political move and does not take residents into account for either McKinney or Prosper. Stop trying to force your political agenda for additional tax revenue.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.
1420	2/19/2023	Maria Ortiz	Online	The expansion of 380 in Prosper and McKinney should have been planned 10 years so. You all are way to behind to continue this project. Stop proposing reactive options and be more proactive and build the next highway where the land is open. What about Gunter? Celina? Both McKinney and Celina have been very vocal about the opposition of 380, move on, stop continuing to propose the same nonsense. We DO NOT want it!	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.  Results of public and stakeholder input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix that can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1421	4/20/2023	Maria V	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1422	4/20/2023	Marianne R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A will deeply affect our neighborhood	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1423	3/16/2023	Marie D'Emidio	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1424	3/7/2023	Marie Wilson	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1425	4/20/2023	Marilou W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to option A, YES to option B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1426	3/27/2023	Marilyn Semrad	Email	Subject: Support plan D Plan D is the obvious best choice for the McKinney US 380 bypass. Why is Plan C even being considered? Marilyn Semrad Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted. Although TxDOT recommended a single alignment at the conclusion of TxDOT's US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study, there were some other alternatives that are also reasonable, and those alternatives required more detailed study during the environmental review (NEPA) phase of the project, including alternatives that were eliminated during the Feasibility Study. Because this phase of the project involves a more detailed evaluation and collection of new information, it is possible that data being gathered in the environmental review process could change previously studied alignments or lead TxDOT to consider new alternatives. Thus, after the completion of the evaluation in the DEIS, Segment A, E, and C became the Preferred Alternative.
1427	3/31/2023	Marjorie C. Wilkes	Written Comment Form	To: Stephen Endres, Date 3/31/23 I Strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the 380 Bypass from Coit Rd to Fm 1827. Why did you change your mind? The recommended Segment A makes NO Sense! Please Support Segment B. Sincerely, Marjorie C. Wilkes 1313 Hidden Meadow Rd McKinney TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1428	3/16/2023	Marjorie Wilkes	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1429	4/17/2023	Marjorie Wilkes	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Marjorie Wilkes 1313 Hidden Meadow Road McKinney TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1430	4/5/2023	Mark and Caren Wilson	Online	My wife and I both believe the Preferred rout of C,E,A is the best one for almost everyone involved. No matter how you do this someone will not be happy and I agree this is the best way for most of the people being affected.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1431	2/24/2023	Mark and Jennifer DeLano	Email	Good evening, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1432	2/25/2023	Mark and Pam Criss	Email	Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX. for 19 years, we strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Mark and Pam Criss 1204 Thornberry Drive Mckinney TX 75071	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1433	2/26/2023	Mark DeLano	Email	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX for over 20 years, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. This is only if we can't just build 380 on 380. Why can't we do that? The citizens of McKinney should not be made to suffer for TxDOT's lack of action when it comes to keeping up with growth. They knew that this would be an issue but still never acted. They could have avoided this if they would have moved to improve the hwy 10 years ago. Now citizens are being affected terribly. It may cost more but I vote to build through 380 all the way to US 75. It's a hwy. Those on the hwy knew what it was and took a risk building there. In contrast, people out in the pastures never expected to get a hwy through their land. Let those who took the risk pay. Not those who were just trying to make a life and a home. Let's not decide this based on money. Let's decide based on right and wrong. It's a hwy and has been for a very long time.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. The Green Alternative, or Segment F, from Coit Road to FM 1827 (also referred to as "keeping 380 on 380" or expanding the existing US 380 to a freeway), was identified during the Feasibility Study, but ultimately was not carried forward for further analysis after because it would have displaced more than 30 residents and 200 businesses including Raytheon.</p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
1434	4/20/2023	Mark F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1435	4/20/2023	Mark F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B provides a more direct east-west route for the bypass, and also avoids a larger number of developed residential neighborhoods.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1436	4/20/2023	Mark J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose the proposed "Segment A" expansion.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1437	2/25/2023	Mark Johnston	Online	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1438	4/5/2023	Mark S. Watjen	Email	<p>Good afternoon Mr. Endres!</p> <p>I hope you are having a wonderful day. I live in Princeton and, frankly, this prospective road seems like a waste of time, effort and money. A northern route around McKinney, from Princeton, is not a solution to our traffic congestion. Myself and many of my neighbors are going to go West on 380 (towards McKinney) but turn south towards 121 to go West or South on 75. Additionally, most people coming to Princeton are going to come from 121 or 75 North and not heading east on 380. The best solution I have seen, from a Princeton perspective, is a 380 to HWY 5 connection. My apologies for not having a reference link, but you may know more about that than I do. Thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please let me know.</p> <p>Mark S. Watjen</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>At this time, TxDOT has four projects throughout Collin County on US 380 and one on Spur 399 in schematic design to construct a freeway. This US 380 EIS project and the Spur 399 Extension EIS project are separate projects with independent utility. That said, the Preferred Alternative for the Spur 399 EIS project would provide a freeway connection between US 75/SRT-SH 121 and US 380 to address the connectivity and mobility needs identified without any additional improvements. More information about the Spur 399 EIS project can be found at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/other/spur-399-extension-environmental-impact-statement-from-us-75-to-us-380">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/other/spur-399-extension-environmental-impact-statement-from-us-75-to-us-380</a>.</p>
1439	2/19/2023	Mark Smith	Online	Section A - Total opposition! The expansion should continue along route E. Not in favor of it dropping back down to 380. Need a brand new alternative route further North.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. There are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
1440	4/20/2023	Mark W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please go with route B. Thank you.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1441	2/21/2023	Mark Wilson	Online	Blue is by far the best route.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1442	2/6/2023	Mark/ Wendi Farqhar	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1443	2/24/2023	Marlon Monsalve	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Marlon Monsalve	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1444	3/10/2023	Marshall Wright	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Marshall Wright	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1445	3/23/2023	Martha Doose	Email	Dear Project Manager, Please know that I, as well as many neighbors and other neighborhood residents are choosing to OPPOSE using Segment C of the 380 bypass and prefer Segment D because D impacts fewer residents. Please consider the ramifications involved when you are going forward with this project. . Always put yourself in the residents situation as if it were your own. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Martha Doose 3003 Crossing Dr. Anna, TX 75409	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1446	2/17/2023	Martha McDowell	Online	This farm has been in my family since 1955. I have not kept it all these years so an 8 lane highway could go through my property. People sitting in traffic at rush hour is normal and not my problem. So many more business and homes are effective on segment C then on D.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1447	2/6/2023	Martin Vasquez	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D?</p> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1448	4/20/2023	Martina G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I cannot understand why Option A was chosen when it is so much more expensive and impacts more homes, school and businesses. Is it that campaign donations carry more weight than common sense. Look for the study by other equine centers have done that says construction and new roads near them have had no impact. Proof of that is the widening of N Custer. There are more ways for fire trucks and ambulances to reach Option B communities than say Tucker Hill	According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1449	3/10/2023	Martina Gistaro	Online	As a Tucker Hill homeowner for 10 years, I have several comments to make about the more expensive Option A which will impact our community. I do not understand why the road was moved 100 feet closer to our community from the parcel of land that has not even been developed. Makes me think politics which has effected much of the decision making. Whenever construction begins in front of us, traffic will be a nightmare. With only two exits leaving Tucker Hill, which front 380, it is already hard enough to exit, especially taking a left turn, during the coming and returning to and from work or school. What happens when backed up traffic due to construction prevents the fire department getting here in time to save a house or an ambulance to save a life. Construction will take years to finish if it is anything like the other areas of construction I have witnessed. That's a long time to pray we don't have a community disaster because of it.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The Segment A shift that was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1450	4/16/2023	Martina Gistaro	Email (2)	<p>On Apr 16, 2023, at 5:39 PM, Ed Gistaro &lt;[REDACTED]&gt; wrote:  Mr. Endres,  I lived in San Antonio during the widening of IH10. As bad as it was, it did not compare to what happened when completed. You see, the widening ended at a two lane bridge at Camp Bullis Road. Talk about a nightmare congestion. Now, my question to you is why does the bypass have eight lanes?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Since growth is headed up 75 north from 380, isn't it in the cards to build another east/west route in that direction?</li> <li>2. I envision the same merging nightmare when the eight lane bypass and frontage roads merge with existing six lanes.</li> <li>3. If there is a need for eight lanes, especially further west, wouldn't a six lane bypass merging further west near Custer into an eight lane be just as advantageous and displace fewer homes and businesses. Seems to me if you are dead set on spending more than Option A and also imperiling lives too, this might cause a bit less of each. I bought my home thinking that, as a now 84 year old widow, I would be comfortable knowing a medical complex was just down the street with minimum time to get there. Also, as a front porch community, I very much enjoy being outside listening to birds, breathing clean air and conversing with neighbors who pass by. Too bad you can't guarantee that will continue with construction, air and noise pollution. If east/west traffic flow is so important, why didn't you widen 121 to eight lanes? That certainly would have impacted homes and businesses very little. To swing the bypass as far north as it will be, why not swing it south to join 121 instead? Please explain the logic of the options as they stand today. Sincerely,  Martina Gistaro</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p>
1451	2/18/2023	Marty K.	Online	<p>6 lanes on 380 in Prosper is more than sufficient. No need for people to drive any faster on this road which is already dangerous. The community does not want the road to be any larger than it already is. There should be more lights just like in McKinney. They have made 380 great for residents. Keep it as is as slow it down.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative (as well as all Build Alternatives) effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>TxDOT has found that if we do nothing, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future, even if all the planned roadways in Collin County including the Outer Loop, are constructed. Therefore, a US 380 freeway is needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>Results of public and stakeholder input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1452	3/15/2023	Mary	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Tx. I strongly OPPOSE the construction of segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understood TxDot has existing option, segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge ranch residents, Ridgecrest residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827, Sincerely, Mary Garcia Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1453	4/20/2023	Mary	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1454	4/20/2023	Mary and William S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1455	3/8/2023	Mary Ann Cowley	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Mary Ann Cowley McKinney resident since 1996	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1456	4/2/2023	Mary Ann Pierce	Email	<p>I don't care how much money the Darlings have paid to get Segment A Passed, we all know this is disgraceful! As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Mary Ann Pierce Sent from Mail for Windows</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1457	4/3/2023	Mary Baumgarten	Online	<p>As a McKinney resident, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B ignores the findings of the environmental study, applies criteria to support this decision inconsistently, is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers and places an unsupportable financial burden on the City of McKinney and its taxpayers.</p> <p>Findings of the Environmental Impact Study should have led to selection of Segment B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No businesses displaced, rather than 15 current businesses displaced in Segment A.</li> <li>• 2 rather than 7 major utility conflicts in Segment A</li> <li>• No hazardous material sites impacted, rather than 2 in Segment A.</li> <li>• Nearly twice the impact to rivers and streams; ½ mile vs. 1 mile</li> <li>• Segment A impacts more than 30 irreplaceable Heritage trees, aged over 150 years.</li> </ul> <p>Segment B saves over \$150 million dollars for Collin County Taxpayers vs. Segment A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$153M in right of way costs, rather than \$198M in Segment A.</li> <li>• \$25M in utility relocation costs, rather than \$75 in Segment A.</li> <li>• \$588M in design and construction costs rather than \$608M in Segment A.</li> <li>• \$40M savings in utility relocation for the City of McKinney.</li> </ul> <p>TXDOT's own findings indicate that the continued emphasis on ManeGait is unwarranted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design updates to Segment B have fully mitigated any impact to ManeGait</li> <li>• TXDOT has received a copy of a study from Shea Center &amp; Dreamcatchers, California service ranch with a similar project that impacted their area which found there was minimal impact.</li> <li>• TXDOT has said that Segment B "would not make the ManeGait inaccessible to persons with disabilities and would not violate the Americans with Disabilities Act" Priority has not been given to safety and the increased risk of fatal</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. TxDOT is also still evaluating the impacts of the Segment A shift which was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing. It did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>accidents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Segment A contains two 90 degree turns with a change of grade which will present a greater risk of fatal accidents.</li> <li>• TXDOT did not reveal the comparison between fatality analysis for Segment A &amp; B</li> </ul> <p>Segment A involves reconstructing an additional 3.8 miles of existing 380 Highway increasing the risk of work zone accidents, and disrupting existing traffic patterns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to TXDOT, 26,000 work zone crashes in 2021 resulted in 244 deaths.</li> <li>• The extended construction time required to regrade the existing road bed will increase the disruption to existing traffic for several years of construction.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria used to support Segment selection was not applied consistently. The criteria applied to recommend Segment C, would conclude Segment B is the preferred option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C vs. D was compared based on objective cost data</li> <li>• A vs. B comparison featured subjective measures, such as counting the number of comments submitted vs. objective facts</li> </ul> <p>The current TXDOT budget and plans do not include the mitigation measures necessary to address the impact of increased environmental and noise pollution, as well as concerning traffic hazards, for the current McKinney neighborhoods impacted by Segment A. In addition to the depressed roadway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sound wall across the full length of Tucker Hill property fronting 380 consistent with the character of the entry being removed and providing privacy from cut thru traffic.</li> <li>• The extension of Stonebridge Drive and new entrance on Townsend Boulevard for Tucker Hill residents in the character of the current entrance at Tremont Boulevard.</li> </ul>	<p>State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TXDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TXDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TXDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.</p> <p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B is noted. The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TXDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TXDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TXDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>TXDOT provides a summary of fatal and injury crashes by alternative on page 2-33 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TXDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TXDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TXDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TXDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TXDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1458	4/20/2023	Mary Beth P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	My health will be impacted by this decision. Not only is it fiscally irresponsible, but pollution noise and environmental impact to residents is adverse.	<p>Your comment is noted. Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas</p>
1459	4/12/2023	Mary Beth Piper	Online	I moved to Tucker Hill Mckinney 41/2 years ago from Flower Mound, Texas. I was a public school teacher for 23 years and had to retire two years ago due to a neurological condition. My condition is diagnosed and I receive ongoing treatment. I'm extremely sensitive to sensory input. I move to tucker hill for a quiet environment with nature all around me. A roadway of this size surrounding two sides of Tucker Hill. Will impact my health and my availability to continue living here. I'm a single person who expected to live here forever. The environmental impact on our community will be significant. Therefore I oppose segment A proposed highway extension of 380.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1460	3/22/2023	Mary Blanchette	Email	Dear Mr. Stephen Endres, Please use the plans for the 380 bypass that impacts fewer residents, Segment D. I completely oppose the use of Segment C as it will cause the loss of the source of our honey which we use daily. The Borchard ranch is home to their beehives as well as my sister's hives. The bees will not stay so close to such a massive highway. Segment C will also displace a family that has been on their ranch for 4 generations. Please consider the families and their livelihoods. Use Segment D and not Segment C for the 380 bypass. Most Sincerely, Mary Blanchette	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1461	3/18/2023	Mary Borchard	Online	<p>TxDOT Public Comment I am writing in opposition to the Blue (A-E-C) alignment and specifically to oppose segment C. The Texas Department of Public Transportation (TxDOT) chose the Purple (A-E-D) alignment following their feasibility study. They continued to choose segment A after the Environmental Impact Study (EIS), however they changed from segment D to segment C. Given the reasons listed in the EIS for choosing Segment A, it does not make sense to have switched to segment C (instead of continuing to choose segment D).</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
1462	2/22/2023	Mary Carr	Online	<p>I feel like no matter what we say, we are being ignored. We don't have the political connections that some in Option B have so our voice doesn't matter. As a senior I can't believe my tax dollars are being spent on a more expensive route without thinking TXDOT doesn't care about the expense because it's just tax payers money. We were told that they don't look at the money. Shouldn't you be looking? Instead of looking at possible future homes why aren't you more concerned with the impact on homes that are already built. If you'd invested your money into a nice neighborhood, how would you feel if someone then decided to build 8 lanes in front of your neighborhood! Put yourself in our place...how would you feel? The noise and congestion will reduce not only our homes value (the largest investment we own) , but also our quality of life. Businesses already in place will be removed. What about the impact to those lives! It truly feels like the little guy once again gets stepped on.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment B is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices which did include an analysis of project costs.</p>
1463	3/12/2023	Mary Carr	Email	<p>I'd like to formally make a request for an extension of the comment period for US380. Having just learned that it has been proposed that the bypass be moved even closer to Tucker Hill than was shown at the resent in person meeting. Additional time is needed to fully understand the impact and options that are available to protect Tucker Hill, Stonebridge and other communities impacted by Option A. Regards, Mary Carr Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1464	4/18/2023	Mary Carr	Email	<p>I'm a senior citizen living in Tucker Hill who has concerns about the proposed Option A for the 380 bypass.                      It seems to me that entering and exiting onto 380 during construction will be extremely difficult.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Is there a plan in place to address entering and exiting safely during the construction phase?</li> <li>* How will construction impact emergency vehicles access?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We have many seniors who live in this neighborhood After construction we will have the new bypass dumping all of that traffic at our door steps, along with the already busy 380 traffic that will have even more lanes. You have forecast 380 getting even busier in the future.</li> </ul> </li> <li>* Did anyone research the impact of turns on Option A compared to Option B?</li> </ul> <p>I understand there has been a request to move the 380 bypass closer to Tucker Hill to provide an even wider birth for a new building site that doesn't even have forms set.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Why would that even be an option considering the impact on an existing neighborhood?</li> <li>* Isn't an existing neighborhood as important as a potential new building site?</li> </ul> <p>Again as a senior we sit outside on our front porch a lot. That's one of the reasons we selected this neighborhood for our retirement home.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* How is the additional traffic, which will be adding more noise and exhaust (air quality) going to impact the health of seniors and young children who want to be outside?</li> <li>* How was the current testing process done? Using state of the art equipment, did you select an existing location comparable to the distance Tucker Hill will be to the new bypass to run your test? Just taking readings on my Apple watch in neighborhoods with freeways comparable to ours yields results that can be damaging to hearing. According to the notices that kept popping up on my Apple Watch these levels of noise can cause hearing loss.</li> <li>* With the even heavier traffic that is forecasted in the future, isn't it fair to assume the air quality will be even worse ?</li> </ul> <p>Which will negatively impact all the seniors who live here and children with breathing issues. How were your air quality tests done? Were they conducted at locations with high traffic as ours will be?</p> <p>While I understand the need to help with the current level of 380 traffic and to assist in plans for the future, it's my assumption that you would also be concerned with the potential damage to seniors and children in the areas that you are reviewing. Shouldn't tax paying current homeowners be given as much consideration as potential future new homeowners? As a tax payer for very many years, I expect those individuals that are using my tax dollars to be good stewards with how they spend that money. Treating tax payers money as you would with your own finances, would you over spend to get less for your money? Which is what you are doing by selecting Option A. Regards,</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.</p> <p>The Segment A shift that was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>Mary Carr Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
1465	4/17/2023	Mary Edwards	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres, NO to Segment A YES to Segment B</p> <p>As a homeowner in Stonebridge Ranch and citizen of McKinney, TX., I am not in favor of the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mary</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1466	2/28/2023	Mary Elizabeth Alberson	Email	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I am a citizen of Collin county emailing you in regards to the proposal for the 380 bypass. I ask that you reconsider your plan to go with plan C as it effects many peoples lives including my family. my family and I do not live in the proposed area, however we are friends with a family who do. This family has been a huge support to our girls through their homeschool journey allowing us to utilize their property for learning purposes. my girls have been able to learn about the growing process by watching a peach tree grow and produce over the years, they have learn about and formed a true passion for horses by helping to care for them and ride them. They have studied the properties and habits of bees and the honey making process. They have learn discipline and respect on this property many times over. All of the experiences and opportunities would be taken away from my children and many other children if you put an eight lane highway through the property. please reconsider your decision, think about the future generation and the lessons they learn through this. thank you for your time.</p> <p>A concerned citizen</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1467	3/15/2023	Mary Epner	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I would like to express my support for TXDOT's preferred alignment for US 380 from Coit Rd to FM 1827, which is the Blue alternative, linking Segments A,E, and C. Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Mary Epner  <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">[REDACTED]</span>  4130 Glacier Point Ct.  Prosper, TX  469-222-6601</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1468	3/15/2023	Mary Garcia	Email	<p>Mr. Enders,</p> <p>As a resident of Prosper, I would like to urge you to consider :  Alignment A or widen 380</p> <p>Thank you,  Mary Garcia  3841 Glacier Point Court  Texas 75078  Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment, support of Segment A, and opposition of Segment B is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which does not include Segment B.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1469	2/25/2023	Mary Krogh	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,            With great respect, I ask that you consider my comments below regarding the 380 bypass. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Reasons to consider OPPOSING Segment A:            Costs taxpayers \$98.8 million more            Impacts 57% more natural wetlands &amp; wildlife            Negatively impacts Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods</p> <p>Reasons to SUPPORT Segment B:            Requires 73% fewer business and residential displacements            Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at U.S. 380 &amp; Custer Road            14% shorter, saving time and money</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,            Mary Krogh            6704 Mission Ridge, McKinney, TX 75071</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1470	4/20/2023	Mary Lee F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I support plan B. Plan a was significantly hurt the lifestyle of Stonebridge Ranch.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1471	4/20/2023	Mary Lou B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Section A. Yes to Section B which is less costly, less disruptive to businesses and homeowners communities, reducing more of 380 congestion.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1472	3/20/2023	Mary Lynn Creme	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres and Tx Dot: I respectfully request you to reconsider the “announced” choice of Route A rather than Route B. There are many reasons, but I will try to be brief.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When we moved here into Tucker Hill 8 years ago, route 380 did not even have a stop light into our entrance, and there was supposed to be a little school next door, and it was a perfect community. Many of us are retired homeowners, and this was chosen to be our “last home” since it would be near to family. We understand that Route B would potentially displace less people (homes), and businesses who are already here in good faith.</li> <li>2. Route B would be a good deal much less expensive. Why would you choose a more expensive route – especially in these tough and going to be tougher times?</li> <li>3. Route B would actually be less dangerous because there is so much truck traffic and will be for a very, very long time, and trucks cannot navigate right hand turns. One accident will cause the road to be blocked and there will be many of those with the long construction trucks that are here in droves every day. There is also the problem of the road noise for all the people in the neighborhood, which appears to be very dangerous to their health, due to the congestion caused by your proposed road changes, and apparently Route A would mean no stop lights that would slow down the traffic.</li> <li>4. Are you actually saying that horses are more important than human beings? The horses have been right out there by all that construction on Custer Road. It is much easier to move a barn and horses than upset so many people’s lives. I hope that the rumors than this is most important part of this decision, horses vs. real people, will not be shown to be true. Help us, please!</li> </ol> <p>Sincerely yours, Mary Lynn Creme</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.</p> <p>Public input received about ManeGait and preliminary cost estimate for each segment were several of the many factors TxDOT considered when comparing Segments A and B, as shown in the Segment Analysis Matrix.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
1473	4/20/2023	Mary M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Please go with Plan B and do not put excessive noise, traffic and other potentially dangerous situations so close to neighborhoods that purchased homes not aware of this change. Do not put displacing homes and businesses aside for the sake of progress. Plan B is also more expensive for taxpayers.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1474	3/7/2023	Mary Mikula	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Mary Mikula	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1475	2/19/2023	Mary Nugent	Online	I am encouraged by the EIS Recommendation to Keep 380 on 380 in Prosper. The depiction represents stakeholder feedback to Keep 380 on 380 in Prosper.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1476	4/20/2023	Mary O	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	US 380 Proposed Route- NO to Segment A, Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1477	2/25/2023	Mary P Laster	Email	Mr. Endres, Respectfully, I request your consideration of the 380 proposal for Segment A. I am in support of Segment B. Segment B was presented as having less disruption to homes and businesses with a cost of much less than Segment A. Thus, it comes as a complete surprise that your organization or someone within are supporting Segment A. What is the rationale behind this? Can you send me a cost analysis and property disruption analysis please? Without this, it appears something suspicious and fishy is going on, perhaps influence of someone or a business that TxDOT is supporting. I am a homeowner and citizen of McKinney Texas and strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Mary P Laster 1505 Montclair Circle McKinney TX 75071 816.289.5428	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Your comment is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B  Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. Section 3.1 of the EIS addresses right-of-way and property displacements. Information about costs associated with each segment can be found in the Segment Analysis Matrix also available at <a href="http://www.keekeepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keekeepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1478	4/20/2023	Mary R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1479	4/20/2023	Mary S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A. Option B would be better for all	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1480	2/17/2023	Mary Spaulding	Online	Please keep 380 on 380 at least thru Prosper.	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
1481	2/10/2023	Mary Turner	Online	Please add additional lights on 380 and reduce the speed limit. Cars drive too fast and there are too many accidents. Widening of the road and increasing traffic will make it worse for the local people of Prosper to get around. Of all the people I've talked to, no one is in favor of widen the road and increasing traffic. Look for alternative routes that are not 380. What about Frontier? That seems to be much more aligned with the extension you are proposing.	<p>Your comment is noted. You can find information about the traffic analysis conducted for the Blue Alternative in the DEIS. Please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.</p> <p>It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p> <p>The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p>
1482	2/19/2023	Mary Williams	Email	Hello Stephen, I write to you to oppose C and support D. I do not agree plan C is the best route for the 380 bypass as you are disrupting numerous homesteads, community resources along with businesses. This route will destroy a property that provides a place for bible groups to meet, and worship events as well as a riding stable for youths to ride. I personally have attended bible studies at Amber & Dan Block's home as well as purchased honey and eggs from this homestead. There are children that come to ride horses/therapy and they hold religious groups, and activities. Also, why would you damage one of the largest REMAINING forests in central Collin County? I've been a resident of McKinney for 16 years, please keep the	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				forests, woodlands, and wetlands! Warm Regards, Mary	<p>Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1483	3/16/2023	Maryam Mirmuhseni	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1484	4/20/2023	Marilyn K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	A would ruin her new retirement home.	Your comment is noted.
1485	4/20/2023	Mascha M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Keep McKinney "Unique by Nature". We are tired of taking up the tax burden for other cities to reap the rewards and for us to lose what attracted long-term residents to begin with. Families that have been here for generations are leaving. "Progress" isn't always good; this highway needs to be as far away from McKinney as possible. We don't want the traffic noise, and we don't want any more air pollution!	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. TxDOT has found that if we do nothing, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future, even if all the planned roadways in Collin County including the Outer Loop, are constructed. Therefore, a US 380 freeway is needed to relieve congestion.
1486	3/16/2023	Matt Hatch	Email	Hello Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Matt Matt Hatch [REDACTED] 817-657-9075	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1487	3/13/2023	Matt Lear	Email	Formally requesting an extension to the comment period. We need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. The same extension should apply to those affected by Option D. It boggles the mind a path with no business or home impacts is rejected in favor of one that does both. Matt Lear 2754 Majestic Ave McKinney, TX 75071 970-390-3036	This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing. Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .  According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Due to the constraints in the study area, all segments would require displacements and impacts of some kind.
1488	4/19/2023	Matt Lear	Email	Mr Endres- While I realize not everyone can visit Tucker Hill, I assume since I've seen you and your staff many times in McKinney over the course of the last 8 years, you've at least driven through here. It's a special place. Right, everyone says that about every place they live. Years ago, we thought we'd finally found an agency who listens to reason, and uses sound judgement for decision making. How disheartening to learn it's largely business as usual and good sense isn't very common. Then to be told the Segment that is more expensive, more invasive, more, impactful is chosen as the preferred route? As Vizzini from the Princess Bride so eloquently put it, "INCONCEIVABLE."  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
1489	4/20/2023	Matt M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a taxpayer I am highly concerned that TxDOT has chosen the more costly option that will destroy existing businesses and residents. Choose Segment B!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1490	4/20/2023	Matt N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Go through Prosper	Your comment is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1491	3/8/2023	Matt Reynolds	Email	Hello Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Thanks, Matt Reynolds	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1492	2/16/2023	Matt Tindall	Online	We need to keep 380 on 380	Your comment is noted.
1493	4/20/2023	Matthew A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A would cause far more permanent disruptions than Segment B. We STRONGLY oppose the construction of Segment A, and will do everything in our power to have TxDot reconsider.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1494	2/17/2023	Matthew Mitchell	Online	We are encouraged that the EIS recommendation is to Keep 380 on 380 through Prosper! Prosper is a committed regional transportation partner and we have done our best to plan for this expansion on it's current path through town.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1495	4/20/2023	Matthew R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1496	3/15/2023	Maureen Buckland	Email	email: Stephen.Endres@txdot.gov As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Maureen Buckland Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1497	3/10/2023	Maureen Dudley	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Enders:</p> <p>I am a homeowner in McKinney, Texas. I OPPOSE Segment A for the US 380 bypass. I believe TXDOT has better options (such as Segment B) that will have less impact on the surrounding neighborhoods and businesses. One of the reasons we chose to live in Stonebridge Ranch was the carefully planned master community. Currently, traffic flows well. The Segment A bypass, however, does not "bypass" McKinney but rather unfairly dumps traffic directly into our master-planned neighborhood. Furthermore, the Segment A route does nothing to help McKinney residents to navigate through our own city, yet it burdens McKinney residents with 120+ million in new taxes. I find that an unjust scenario. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 bypass. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Maureen Dudley 1509 Hackett Creek Drive McKinney, TX 75072</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TXDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,</li> <li>-depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and</li> <li>-providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</li> </ul>
1498	3/21/2023	Maureen Hinkley	Email	<p>Greetings Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing to let you know I oppose, Segment C of the 380 bypass and prefer Segment D because D will impact fewer residents and not impact our bee hive. We harvest and use our honey for medicinal purposes (allergy relief for myself and several grandchildren), and we would not be allowed to move it to our own property due to bylaws of the housing development we live in. We would greatly appreciate your support for Segment D to be the pursued solution. Very best regards, Maureen Hinkley</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>
1499	3/25/2023	Maureen Macaulay	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TXDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Maureen Macaulay Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1500	3/7/2023	Maureen McKenna	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Maureen McKenna 1616 Berwick Drive McKinney TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1501	3/14/2023	Maury Herod	Email	Stephen, As a long- time resident of McKinney and Stonebridge Ranch, I want to formally voice opposition to Segment A. I am fully aligned with the commentary from my HOA below. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Maury Herod	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1502	3/16/2023	Mayu Khoury	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1503	2/17/2023	McKenna Fant	Email	I am writing to tell you that I oppose plan C and support plan D for the 380 bypass. It would destroy several properties of wonderful community members that I know. One in particular has a beautiful property that serves as a community center, hosting many church, art and equestrian events. It would be a huge loss to the community. Thank you. McKenna Fant (573)308-5667	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1504	2/6/2023	McKinney Trucking	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1505	3/10/2023	Megan	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1506	2/17/2023	Megan Duke Lewis	Email	As someone who lives out in the area, I strongly call for the committee to choose a route that most of the residents want. McKinney is exploding with growth and the residents' wants are being overshadowed in many areas. I encourage moving forward with Route D over Route C. The community needs these resources and local businesses. Plowing through a calm, rural area is awful enough, please listen to those who are reaching out. Route C is more disruptive and destructive. Route D might cost more, it might have difficulties to work around, but the residents that live out there matter...and our collective voice needs to count for something. It's not about revenue or convenience, it is about supporting McKinney residents and doing what is right. Route D is our vote! Thank you. Megan Duke Lewis	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1507	3/15/2023	Megan Mossinger	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,                      I am writing to you to share my STRONG opposition to the bypass and Option B running through Prosper. I am a resident of Whitley Place and have been for the last seven years and disagree with the bypass running through Prosper for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12+ lanes going right through Prosper (8 lanes &amp; 4+ access lanes on either side) with the magnitude equal to US 75, located just south of Founders Academy</li> <li>• US 380 Bypass Segment B options + approved Collin Outer Loop (4-6 lanes) just north would sandwich NE &amp; SE Prosper in between 2 major highway thoroughfares</li> <li>• Directly affects and disruptive to numerous neighborhoods: Whitley Place, Whispering Farms, Brookhollow, Christie Farms, Rhea Mills, Gentle Creek, Amberwood, Ladera, etc.</li> <li>• Prosper properly planned for expansion (380 can be widened!). If other towns didn't plan this can't be put on Prosper</li> <li>• Directly impacts multiple schools in Prosper ISD: Cockrell Elementary   Rogers Middle School   Walnut Grove High School and Founders Classical Academy and student drivers</li> <li>• Increased Traffic and Noise</li> <li>• Materially impacts ManeGait and the wonderful therapy they provide to children, veterans, and our disabled community</li> <li>• Exorbitant costs of acquiring rights of way, adverse environmental impacts, wetland mitigation</li> <li>• This design does not make for an acceptable proposal nor effective use of taxpayer money</li> <li>• School buses having to go on a highway to take kids to school / young drivers for the high school having to deal with highways and high speeds</li> <li>• Significant environmental impact: pollution, emissions, &amp; poor air quality</li> <li>• Safety of our citizens and students</li> <li>• Decreased home values and overall desire of area</li> <li>• Massive utility relocations that are critical to Prosper's infrastructure</li> <li>• Substantial lost tax revenue to the Town and Prosper ISD</li> </ul> <p>In closing, I highly oppose Option B and want 380 to stay on 380 or Option A to be considered.                      Megan Mossinger                      4060 Chimney Rock Drive                      Prosper, Texas 75078</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment A, and opposition of Segment B is noted. The Preferred Alternative selected was the Blue Alternative, which does not include Segment B.</p>
1508	4/20/2023	Megan P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>US 380 Proposed Route - NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1509	3/14/2023	Megan Roberts	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost LESS, REDUCE the tax BURDEN on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. It's been very disappointing to see the decisions being made regarding this matter and to see special interest and special treatment being given to particular people because of the money in their pockets and political connections. Thank you for your time!            Make it a great day!            Megan</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1510	4/20/2023	Melanie S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I oppose Option A. I have lived in McKinney since 2002 and lived through 121 being built. 380 is in my backyard and I don't want to be able to hear it all the time. I can already hear it sometimes. Plus it's more expensive.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1511	2/17/2023	Melinda Atienza	Online	<p>To TXDOT:                      I firmly oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:                      1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.                      2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.                      3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.                      4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.                      5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.                      6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.                      7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.                      Sincerely,                      Melinda Atienza                      Frisco, TX</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1512	4/20/2023	Melissa B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, Yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1513	4/20/2023	Melissa H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B costs less money and has less impact on existing homes and businesses.	Your comment is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1514	2/21/2023	Melissa Hay	Email	<p>Good evening, I would like to provide you with feedback regarding the proposed "Blue Alternative" US 380 expansion. I STRONGLY oppose this option for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Numerous citizens will be displaced and removed from their homes and businesses will be lost.</li> <li>2. Residents in homes adjacent to homes/businesses removed will experience a substantial decrease in property value and will have their quality of life negatively impacted.</li> <li>3. As a taxpayer in McKinney, I will bear the burden of tax dollars utilized for construction on an option we do not support.</li> <li>4. Other route options would not displace residents and force them to leave their homes.</li> <li>5. The Blue Alternative is, to be quite blunt, an asinine route. If you are going to create a bypass, then create a bypass - not a road with a lot of turns.</li> </ol> <p>I understand that the residents of Prosper have more money, more time to protest, and more political pull but no rational person would look at all of the proposed routes and choose the Blue Alternative. I understand that the option that makes the most sense would not allow Main Gait to expand. When I look at a business not expanding vs people losing their homes and businesses, there is only one reasonable choice. You must reconsider and find a different alternative to the route being proposed.</p> <p>Melissa Hay Liberty Place Stonebridge Ranch</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1515	4/20/2023	Melissa P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please save taxpayers money, save businesses and homes in our community, and implement option B.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1516	3/16/2023	Melissa Robles	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1517	4/20/2023	Melissa S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1518	2/19/2023	Melissa Shelton	Email	Dear Mr. Endres and The Texas Department of Transportation, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed expansion of 380 after Custer Road, known as Option A. My primary concern is the staggering cost of this project, which is estimated to be \$100 million more than any other option. This is an unjustifiable expense for taxpayers, especially when there are more cost-effective solutions available. Furthermore, I am deeply troubled by the impact that Option A would have on existing businesses and homes in the area. The expansion would require the demolition of numerous homes and businesses, which would potentially displace families and disrupt communities. This is unacceptable and unnecessary, given that there are other options available that would only affect future homes and developments. In contrast, Option B would only affect future homes and Mane gate, which would have a much smaller impact on the local community and can be easily relocated. This option would also be much more cost-effective, making it a much more reasonable and practical solution for all parties involved. It is important to note that the local community strongly opposes Option A, and many residents and business owners have expressed their concerns about the impact it would have on their homes and livelihoods. As public servants, it is your duty to represent the interests of the community, and I urge you to take these concerns into account when making your decision. In conclusion, I urge you to reject Option A and instead explore more cost-effective and less disruptive solutions, such as Option B. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Sincerely,	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Due to the constrained study area, none of the alignment options studied would not result in some kind of residential or business displacement. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.  Public input is one of many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process. The Blue Alternative was selected as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing comparative evaluation matrices. Results of public and stakeholder input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				Melissa Shelton 972-839-3486	
1519	4/20/2023	Melissa W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I drive out there often!! I visit my daughter who lives out there. The traffic will be unbearable & the noise once completed will make living near 380 also unbearable!	Your comment is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.
1520	2/25/2023	Melody Nicholson	Email	Mr. Endres, With great respect, I ask that you consider my comments below regarding the 380 bypass. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Reasons to consider OPPOSING Segment A: Costs taxpayers \$98.8 million more Impacts 57% more natural wetlands & wildlife Negatively impacts Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods Reasons to SUPPORT Segment B: Requires 73% fewer business and residential displacements Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at U.S. 380 & Custer Road 14% shorter, saving time and money Thank you for your consideration, Melody Nicholson Resident of Ridgecrest - McKinney TX	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1521	4/20/2023	Merle S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am vehemently opposed to the Segment A route as it makes no sense at all. It is more costly and destroys homes and businesses unnecessarily. The disruption is excessive. Segment B makes so much more sense in every way. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure this out, and the politicians will feel the impact if moving forward. Do what is right for Texas and McKinney!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1522	4/20/2023	Merrick M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly disagree with the proposed placement of the 380 bypass. It will bring increased noise to our neighborhood and cause terrible congestion at our only neighborhood entrance.	Your comment is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1523	4/20/2023	Merritt W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This is not the best option!!	Your comment is noted.
1524	3/16/2023	Meshell Baker	Email	<p>Here is why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• Destroy 71% more acres of forests and woodlands</li> <li>• Destroys 141% more acres of grassland and prairie</li> <li>• Disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• Eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.</li> <li>• Affects and displaces 383% more of homes ( 29 versus 6)</li> <li>• Affects and displaces 300% more businesses ( 16 versus 4)</li> <li>• Affects and displaces more community resources</li> <li>• Strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife</li> </ul> <p>— * [REDACTED] * Be Someone's Blessing Today 🙏</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1525	2/17/2023	Mia Redd	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D. So it doesn't even make sense on this fact alone!</li> <li>3) Section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D. Again same as above.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D. It's incredibly selfish to purposely ruin ANY remaining forests we have left in the county.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Same reasons above!</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance. I mean the worst!!! Why would you even consider making traffic more congested.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1526	3/15/2023	Mica Pryor	Email	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodland and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. Route C will destroy an area that I have known and loved as a long-time resident of the area. If Route C is imposed, we will lose access to community riding arenas, wooded trails, and outdoor pursuits. While Route C may be the more economical option in</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable.                      Mica Pryor, Vice President, Licensed Attorney, Sales Agent                      M&amp;D Real Estate                      Office (Direct Line): 469.653.0485                      Cell: 214.505.0940                      Sent from iPhone</p>	<p>River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1527	3/28/2023	Michael Aceves	Email (2)	Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Michael Aceves	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1528	4/20/2023	Michael B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	US 380 Proposed Route - NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1529	3/29/2023	Michael Chandler	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Michael Chandler	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1530	4/20/2023	Michael G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I support plan B.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1531	4/3/2023	Michael Gonzalez	Online (2)	I believe better or improved access needs to be addressed regarding east bound access to Stickhorse Ln and County Road 1084 in Segment C. We live at the cusp of three projects and this access needs to be better addressed. Thank you!	Your comment is noted. Design in this area is still underway and will connect all three projects. A future Public Hearing for the Princeton project will be held to provide more details and an updated design. You can find project information and sign up to receive Public Hearing notices at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a> .  During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.
1532	4/20/2023	Michael H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Adamantly against Segment A plan for 380. I cannot understand why the most EXPENSIVE plan is put forth as the best. Segent B is the plan my wife and I support.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1533	3/16/2023	Michael Hiefner	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1534	2/6/2023	Michael J McBroom	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1535	4/20/2023	Michael L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly disagree with this alignment and push for alignment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1536	4/20/2023	Michael L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please use B, E, C!	Your comment and support of Segments B, E, and C is noted.
1537	4/20/2023	Michael M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A, Yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1538	4/20/2023	Michael M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote for segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1539	3/20/2023	Michael Morris	Voicemail	Good afternoon. My name is Michael Morris, I am the Director of Transportation at the North Central Texas County Government. I am the Staff Director to the regional transportation council. The regional transportation council is a metropolitan planning organization for the Dallas-Fort Worth region. The purpose of my comment is to support the US 380 bypass around McKinney. It is a new project in the mobility plan, required to be in that mobility plan to move forward. This area of McKinney is one of the fastest growing portions of the region and one of the fastest growing portions of the United States. Status quo improvements on the existing US 380 cannot come anywhere close to handling the growth and a bypass, a new right of way is necessary. So having both the bypass and the existing US 380 is a nice combination in moving forward. Again, for the safety of the constituents of the region and for the mobility needs of a region that now is greater than 8 million persons, growing at 7- growing at excuse me, a million people every 7 years. We would request TxDOT to move forward. Get whatever federal approval is necessary in order for us to begin construction of the US 380 McKinney bypass. Again, thank you for the opportunity to give this comment in support of the employees of the council of governments and in support of the staff to the regional transportation council, the MPO for Dallas-Fort Worth.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1540	3/15/2023	Michael Payne	Email	<p>Stephen,                      I just want to reiterate my support of TXDot choosing Segment A (Blue Alternative) as the primary selection for the 380 bypass. I feel the political winds of McKinney persons not agreeing with this are strong trying to put pressure on TXDot's choice and should not be allowed to influence your final decision. As a Prosper resident living in Whitley Place, I feel McKinney's lack of past planning has been correctly identified with the other items you clearly note as the better location to solve McKinney's traffic issues. I did a good amount of research before buying in Whiteley place and there was no talk of this being a possibility at that time but Segment A was in the discussion. As a side note I am additionally happy that Maingate and the new communities being built along Custer Rd will not be affected by the TXDot choice. Best of fortunes to you and thanks for picking logic over political wants. Best,                      Michael Payne                      Whiteley Place</p>	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.
1541	3/8/2023	Michael Shutka	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.                      Michael Shutka</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
1542	2/17/2023	Michael Swim	Online	<p>I am writing to oppose segment "C" and in favor of segment "D."                      - C divides residential farming / ranching communities                      - C affects and displaces more residences (29 vs. 7) businesses (15 vs. 4) and community resources (7 vs. 0)                      - C damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County                      - C destroys 71% more acres of forest and woodlands                      - C disturbs wetlands and suitable habitat for threatened species (per TXDOT)                      - C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife                      - C has worse overall traffic performance                      Spur 399 can connect equally to segment C or D                      My Daughter and grandson's home is destroyed by the current route as is my wife's horse rescue operation. I own three properties affected: 2150, 2172 and 2280 County Road 338. Please do the right thing for property owners, businesses and the wetlands and choose segment D.                      Michael Swim                      [REDACTED]                      (214) 673-5439</p>	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1543	2/22/2023	Michael Swim	Online	<p>I am writing to oppose segment "C" and support segment "D" or a modified D. Segment C, although cheaper than D, affects 4X the number of residences, will displace 4x the number of businesses, displaces an equestrian farm (Tara Royal) and a horse rescue (2150 CR 338), C destroys the only remaining wetland in northern Colling County, it destroys 70% more forest land than D, and makes less sense for the community overall. Where are those who support segment C other than TXDOT? The City of McKinney has even restated their position and now support segment D or a modified segment D. Please maintain the one remaining "undeveloped" area in the McKinney area and North Colling County - the McKinney ETJ near the east fork of the Trinity River.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area. TxDOT has not received notice from the City of McKinney that their position of which alternative changed.
1544	4/20/2023	Michael W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A and YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1545	3/21/2023	Michael Woodruff	Email	NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Michael Woodruff	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1546		Michael Yoos	Comment Form	Segment D is the right choice, displacing myself and neighbors makes no sense when theres a perfectly fine alternative. Choose D not C	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1547	4/20/2023	Michaela R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1548	3/10/2023	Michaela Roberts	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX. who lives just south of Custer and 380, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for your attention, Michaela Roberts	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1549	3/29/2023	Michel Moffatt	Online	I would prefer that 380 stay on 380 and work on the outer loop plan to alleviate the 380 traffic be expedited, however if that is not possible then I would support the current Blue (A-E-C) route.	<p>Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>
1550	3/15/2023	Michele A. Hunter	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing to voice my support for Route A. I am sure you are well versed in all of the reasons why this would be the ideal route. First I would like to quote TXDOT's own EIS report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It would require the least amount of new right of way.</li> <li>2) It would not displace any community facilities. For example, ManeGait, an organization of the utmost importance to the Collin county community which would unduly be impacted by the alternate B route.</li> <li>3) Results in the least number of noise receptors with substantial noise level increases.</li> <li>4) Be the least impactful on flood plains and regulatory floodways.</li> <li>5) Minimize the conversion of farmland.</li> <li>6) Meet the project Purpose and Need.</li> </ol> <p>Additionally, Prosper has continued to develop as a master planned community with the idea that US380 would be a freeway, changing the route to cut through a significant portion of Prosper would disproportionately affect the Town of Prosper's commercial real estate, and new developments which support its tax base. This would in turn have other down stream effects on Town parks, schools, students, teachers, and residents. I implore you to make a final decision regarding this bypass and stick with the blue route as recommended by TXDOT's own EIS study. Continued delay and discussion has significantly and negatively affected the Collin County community. Thanks for reading! Sincerely,</p> <p>Michele A. Hunter  420 Columbian Ct.  Prosper, TX 75025  Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android</p>	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1551	3/8/2023	Michele Lumley	Email	<p>Mr Stephen Endres, Texas Department of Transportation, 4777 East Highway 80, Mesquite, TX 75150-6643</p> <p>Dear Mr Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I am strongly OPPOSED to the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents as well as the thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, Michele Lumley</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1552	4/20/2023	Michelle B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Segment B will cost less and displace fewer residents/businesses in Collin County. It is the overall best choice for the 380 Bypass.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1553	3/12/2023	Michelle Gladden Snyder	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from Michelle Gladden Snyder's iPhone</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1554	2/18/2023	Michelle Gonzalez	Email	<p>Hello, I hope this finds you well! I am writing to express my dismay over the consideration of segment C for focus area 3 of the US380 extension; attachment to ensure you know which I mean. Segment C would be devastating to many important community resources, including the Block family therapeutic riding center that also serves as a community center, church and sanctuary for many in the community. In addition, segment C would unnecessarily destroy so many other businesses and residences, displacing good people and businesses who are valued in the community. I am in favor of Segment D, which minimizes the negative impact of what is a necessary highway expansion. Thank you for your time and consideration! Concerned citizen, Michelle Gonzalez 407-924-9230 [REDACTED]</p>	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1555	2/27/2023	Michelle Harp	Email	Hello! I live in Collin county and I strongly oppose the C option for the 380 bypass in NE McKinney. I support option D. Thank you for your help in this! Thanks! Michelle Harp 214-708-3936	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1556	4/20/2023	Michelle M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	My home will not be directly affected by the 380 decision, but I am strongly OPPOSED to option A. It does not make sense to spend significantly more money on an option that is too far east of where the traffic is coming from. Apart from Prosper digging in their heels, it is beyond my comprehension that all this extra money is being spent to keep them happy. The negative impact is far more significant to McKinney in terms of loss of existing homes and businesses and it still won't solve the problem. The A segment will solve the problem and at a lower expense to the tax payers. It is incumbent upon all decision makers to serve the needs of the community in the most effective and financially responsible manner possible. Option A will accomplish neither.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.  The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.  The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.
1557	4/20/2023	Michelle N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B!!!!!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1558	3/9/2023	Michelle Payne	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Michelle Payne	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1559	3/15/2023	Michelle Weston	Email	Mr. Endres, I am a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX and strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. Since Segment A makes the most sense for McKinney and its residents, I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Michelle Weston	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1560	2/28/2023	Mike Ambroziak	Online	No to Segment A, Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1561	3/28/2023	Mike Artwick	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Mike Artwick 2516 Ariel Cove McKinney, TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1562	4/7/2023	Mike Bell	Email	<p>Any consideration of releasing the US380 By-Pass traffic back on to 380 East of Custer Road is illogical, dangerous, and is a waste of taxpayers' money. The chosen route displaces more residences and businesses, cost more, and is much more dangerous to drivers. Even with the overpass suggested (which 3 years ago TXDOT said was not needed) Custer intersection will be even more overwhelmed. Please reconsider the current plans to dump traffic East of Custer and create a path that will accomplish the goal of congestion relief, improve traffic flows, reduce accidents, and support the needs of drivers of Collin County and Texas. Please consider logic in lieu of politics in your final decision. Regards, Mike Bell (214) 578-1703 Mike Bell "Taking Care of Business" [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix. Our comparison of Segments A and B showed that there was not a substantial difference in traffic metrics such as travel times, travel speeds, and Level of Service.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1563	4/20/2023	Mike Bull	Email	<p>To whom it may concern: As a McKinney homeowner, Segment A would be detrimental to me personally because of an ongoing battle with PTSD having to do with the events of 9/11 which I was present for at the time. The construction and noise would be detrimental to my mental and physical health. I have also listed other factors that should be considered.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1564	3/8/2023	Mike Bundick	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1565	4/20/2023	Mike G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A Plan. Yes to Segment B Plan which is less disruptive to property and business owners, and less expensive to taxpayers.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1566	4/20/2023	Mike G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>There are several problems associated with high vehicle traffic through residential areas, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns: High traffic volume can increase the risk of accidents and collisions, especially in residential areas where there may be more pedestrians, children, and bicyclists.</li> <li>2. Noise pollution: The constant noise from vehicles can be disruptive and stressful for residents, affecting their quality of life and health.</li> <li>3. Air pollution: Vehicles emit harmful pollutants, including particulate matter and nitrogen oxides, which can negatively impact air quality in residential areas and lead to health problems.</li> <li>4. Reduced property values: High traffic volume can reduce property values, making it more difficult for homeowners to sell their homes or get a fair price for their property.</li> <li>5. Increased traffic congestion: High traffic volume can lead to increased traffic congestion, making it more difficult for residents to get in and out of their neighborhoods, as well as making it difficult for emergency vehicles to respond quickly to calls.</li> <li>6. Increased wear and tear on roads: High traffic volume can increase the wear and tear on roads, leading to more frequent repairs and maintenance, which can be costly for local governments and taxpayers. The Texas DOT should ethically limit high traffic to commercial areas West of Stonebridge Ranch and Custer Road. Protect the citizens living in residential areas.</li> </ol> <p>Re</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. More information about the necessary steps to identify and address community impacts on a TxDOT project can be found at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1567	2/24/2023	Mike Glatz	Online	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1568	4/5/2023	Mike Grimes	Email	Sir, I write to express my position with regard to the TXDOT selection of Segment A over Segment B as their "preferred alignment" - Please get a grip. Not only does Segment A make much more sense in routing & drivability, Segment A reportedly displaces fewer private properties and is projected to cost some \$150 million dollars less than Segment B. I know you can not please everyone, but the choice of Segment A just makes one heck of a lot more sense. Thanks for offering this extension to the comment period. Regards, Mike Grimes 5505 Port Vale Drive McKinney, TX	Your comment is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.  The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.  While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1569	3/7/2023	Mike Kohl	Online	I'm asking TXDOT to please reconsider their decision on Plan A for the 380 bypass. There are a number of different factors to play in my request first and foremost is the exponentially higher impact to restaurants and businesses in the 380 Corridor. There are new, revenue generating businesses being built today, which will be negatively impacted by this buildout. This will cause a substantial tax loss to the state and to the city of McKinney. Second, the overall additional cost (\$200M in 2023 dollars) for Plan A is bound to swell before the first shovel load of dirt is dug. This is an ad cost to the taxpayers that is totally unnecessary and it's not a judicious use of our tax dollars. By either choosing Plan B or, by actually building out an "outer loop" which bypasses 380 altogether, one which will connect the DNT to 75, TXDOT can develop a much more efficient and cost effective way of alleviating the traffic problems now and in the future.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.  The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1570	4/17/2023	Mike Kohl	Email	<p>Mr Endres: I am writing you to provide feedback on TXDOT's decision for Option A. Personally, I don't get it. As a taxpayer and businessman, why would the State choose an option which will cost AT LEAST \$200M more than Option B. This is a direct cost to the taxpayers in a time economically is not prudent. The disruption, the safety factor of having a lack of access to normal entry/access as well as safety vehicles baffles me. Frankly, none of the options make sense in dealing with a traffic problem which is currently being generated and will substantially increase 4-5 miles west of the area. The bulk of the traffic that will be generated in the very near future (from the PGA, Universal Studios and North Texas State) will need to be diverted long before drivers reach either option. Equally important is the increased sound impact to our neighborhood in Tucker Hill. A recent study was done by our neighbors showed that even with a suppressed bypass, the noise levels will exceed those which are considered reasonable. This was performed by one of our neighbors and shows the noise impact of a SIX lane suppressed highway and the noise impact created : <a href="https://youtu.be/-YwQ9dAce4o">https://youtu.be/-YwQ9dAce4o</a>. This noise will only increase with the additional two lanes and will severely impact our ability to enjoy our neighborhood and our livelihood on our front porches, which a number of neighbors use on a regular basis. I personally will be impacted as I work from home and the substantially increased noise will negatively affect the way I am able to conduct my business. Again, NONE of the options make sense. The issue need to be addressed by a true outer loop around McKinney and Prosper that truly and effectively takes the future traffic away from these areas. Respectfully, Mike Kohl 2513 Pearl Street McKinney, TX 75071 Sent from my iPhone without spellcheck</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>TxDOT is also conducting a schematic design and environmental study for US 380 to the east from Teel Parkway/Championship Drive to west of Lakewood Drive in Collin and Denton Counties . Routes being considered include a freeway along the existing US 380. More information about that project can be found at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri</a>.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
1571	3/7/2023	Mike Mikula	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TXDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Mike Mikula Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1572	2/6/2023	Mike Owen Materials, LLC	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1573	3/9/2023	Mike Paley	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1574	2/16/2023	Mike Skorcz	Comment Form	Why isn't the county utilizing the Collin County Outer Loop for this bypass? Most of the traffic on 380 is for local businesses which continues to grow and develop. The Bypass will not alleviate traffic on 380. What's to prevent traffic bypassing on Wilmeth Rd from Hwy 75 to Ridge Road? What happened to option B?	<p>The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1. You can find information about the traffic analysis conducted for the Blue Alternative in the DEIS. Please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1575	3/15/2023	Mike Skorcz	Online	<p>Comment uploaded 380 Bypass comments Option A should be pushed further to the west. There is unpopulated land just west of the proposed option A. Doing this would ease noise and potential through traffic to the Wilmeth Ridge community. It would also space this out from the Ridge Road / Wilmeth Road intersection which is likely to have increased traffic and congestion as a result of it's proximity to the option A route. Option B was my preference, and a better compromise would be to push opt A further west. I do not believe the planned bypass will ease congestion on the existing 380 corridor (University Drive) as most of the traffic is local business traffic which is on the increase as a result of rapid business expansion along with unchecked population growth and residential expansion in the area. Look at 380 through Denton as an example. Rather than a bypass it seems a complete separate E-W route further north where the expansion is occurring is needed along with E-W arteries that also supplement the Collin Co. Outer Loop. The lesson to be learned is that of proper city and urban planning which the county and surrounding communities have failed to do. We are not properly managing the rapid population growth and as a result we find ourselves with infrastructure challenges like we have with roads and traffic. Next up will be water and sewage. We already have a challenged electric grid. Please get smart about managing growth and put together a comprehensive plan for the county with proper city planning before allowing developers to go hog wild building all over the place in a seemingly willy-nilly ad-hoc fashion with little consideration to infrastructure and community bliss.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The Wilmeth Ridge subdivision is a little more than a quarter mile away from the proposed freeway frontage roads. Constraints, such as future developments, would exist in the area west of Segment A. Please reference the constraints map and development heat map made available at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1576	2/6/2023	Mike/Lori Swim	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1577	3/11/2023	Mildred Salas	Online	I live in on off the communities that is going to be impacted for this project, I completely oppose to segment A. Our lives will change dramatically if segment A is built. Yes to segment B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1578	3/14/2023	Mindy B West	Email	Hello, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Mindy B West (972) 804-3700	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1579	3/16/2023	Miracle Scott	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1580	2/22/2023	Missy McPherson	Online	I do not believe that Segment C is the best option. it displaces over 29 residences and 15 businesses as well as 7 much needed community resources. I also have a grave concern about the impact on the few remaining forests and wetlands in the area. The Texas Parks and Wildlife department prefers Segment D. We need to consider factors such as these when we are considering building large areas of traffic.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
1581	4/20/2023	Monica C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1582	4/20/2023	Monica W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Oppose segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1583	4/20/2023	Monte S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Tucker Hill was designed to be a "Front Porch" community with neighbors sitting outside and enjoying conversation... TxDOT has stated there will not be any sound barriers in front but have not commented on sound from East side of encroaching expressway. We will be hit on TWO sides!! Noise decibel levels will be much higher than recommended due to increased speeds & no stop lights!! Any wrecks will cause TH residents extreme hardships getting home to backed up traffic from Ridge or Stonebridge!! "B" Route is less costly, less noise, less destruction of homes/neighborhoods/sound/construction/environment/business!!!!	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p>
1584	3/6/2023	Monte Self	Online	I am against route A since it cost \$200M + more than route B. B affects fewer homes & businesses! A face to face is needed to explain the true reason for route A. Resident, that deals in noise issues, has recorded higher decibels at varying times than your study! It is difficult to understand why future residences are more important than existing residences. The existing 380 should be a Business Route like most cities have and A will only lead to a more congestion due to increased population in NW McKinney & North traveling traffic North/South to 380! A causes more congestion, noise, pollution, costs \$200,000,000+ higher.	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1585	4/19/2023	Monte Self	Email	<p>Stephen Endres, After reading the following comments I felt they were so deeply true that I had to send them for answers and to share my opinion as a Native of McKinney!! "As a McKinney homeowner, I believe in selecting Segment A for the 380 bypass, TxDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents and will demonstrate significant fiscal irresponsibility. This decision is made more egregious with the existence of a viable lower impact alternative. It appears irrefutable that Segment B is the better alternative and that there are serious flaws in the conclusions reached by TxDOT and in the underlying Environmental Impact Study (EIS).</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
1586	3/16/2023	Motomi Hopkins	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1587	3/13/2023	Mounira Roberts	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1588	3/16/2023	Mukesh Sharma	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1589	4/2/2023	Myron Semrad	Email	Mr. Endres, I strongly oppose Segment C of the subject bypass - and support Segment D. Thank you for your consideration. Myron Semrad Richardson, TX	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1590	4/5/2023	N H	Online	I live on Wittenburg Drive in Mckinney in the Wilmeth Ridge community, which is just south of where the proposed bypass will curve southward from Bloomdale road. I am concerned about the noise and dust that will come from construction and traffic that will follow. I would prefer a non-B route. Please consider significant sound barriers wherever the path of this highway will end up. This highway will go through a quiet and peaceful area of the city full of natural wildlife and waterways. I had my house built 3 years ago, and had I known of this proposal, I wouldn't have invested as much into this area.	Your comment and opposition of Segment B is noted. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible.  A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines.
1591	3/9/2023	Nadyne Barker	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Nadyne Barker	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1592	3/15/2023	Nam Quan	Online	Less environmental impact. Less impact on surrounding businesses. Less expensive. It confounds me why TxDOT's preference is for Segment A as opposed to B. That huge massive bedrock at the front of Tucker Hill will skyrocket the proposed Segment A's actual cost. I have not seen any type of clear cut reason why A is the preferred route, but often times politics get in the way and the little people have no power against those with money. While I haven't accepted that A is the winner, I do want to make sure that everyone involved has the best interest in mind of those who are more closely affected, namely those who reside in Tucker Hill. Sound walls, a natural tree-line sound barrier. McKinney, after all, is supposedly unique by nature.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1593	2/20/2023	Nan Beth Campbell	Email	Dear Mr. Endres - New roads to support our rapidly growing communities are important. At the same time, it is equally important to minimize the impact of these new roads on existing residents. I believe that using route D for the 380 Bypass is the best decision that balances these 2 competing interests. The other routes will impact more homes, the therapeutic riding center, and a honeybee facility - important community resource. I strongly encourage following the route D plan. Thank you. Nan Campbell	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted.
1594	3/7/2023	Nancy	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1595	3/16/2023	Nancy Balli	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1596	4/20/2023	Nancy G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please do not destroy the Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods. And, save tax payers millions of dollars by going with A instead of B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1597	3/13/2023	Nancy Gerstner	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1598	4/20/2023	Nancy J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A! YES to segment B!!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1599	2/22/2023	Nancy Lawrence	Online	As a resident of Stonebridge Ranch, I am highly opposed to the choice of Segment A. Segment B would cost tax payers less money, and avoid displacing 15 businesses. With segment A, the noise would be increased for already established homes in Stonebridge Ranch as opposed to new developments that haven't been build yet in Prosper. We have paid years of taxes in McKinney and now our home will be impacted by increased traffic on Stonebridge Road and highway noise.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1600	4/20/2023	Nancy P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	We just moved from McKinney, we have many friends there and go there a lot. How could you build this road and not build a wall question mark	TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1601	4/18/2023	Nancy Preston	Email	<p>To whom it may concern,  I am resubmitting my comments on the TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over segment B in light of new information. Is it true that either Bill Darling or associates of the Darling company used 43 empty lots in Tucker Hill to impersonate residents of Tucker Hill and misrepresent what those actually living in Tucker Hill desire? It is quite concerning if your voice is multiplied many times over due to wealth.  Segment A appears to have 2 90 degree turns that segment B does not have. Is there any data supporting increased safety issues when highways have 90 degree turns? Did TXDOT consider this in their decision?  Is it true that TXDOT shifted Segment A closer to Tucker Hill to protect future development? Are current residents not more important?  Is it true that the air pollution study did not take into account the average wind speeds for the area?  I am appalled by the fiscal irresponsibility of choosing Segment A when there is an alternative that is significantly less expensive. Some of the pros and cons of Segment A vs Segment B can be subjective, but comparing the actual cost between the two is pretty objective and how to you justify the cost?  Thank you,  Nancy Preston  Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B, is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.</p> <p>The Segment A shift that was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p> <p>The CAL3QHC air dispersion model parameters used in the Carbon Monoxide Traffic Air Quality Analysis (CO TAQA) are specified in the TxDOT Environmental Guide: Volume 2 Activity Instructions (DEIS Appendix P, CO TAQA Technical Report, Table 12). The wind speed used was one meter per second (m/s), equivalent to 2.24 miles per hour.</p> <p>The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, these will be updated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p>
1602		Nancy Robertson	Comment Form	<p>Many feel this was a political decision forced upon by Jerry Jones and the Darling family. A shame that the Darlings made 100's of thousands of dollars in Stonebridge Ranch and now could care less about the future of our masterplan community and our home values! Shameful!</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
1603	4/20/2023	Nancy S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to segment A</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1604	2/17/2023	Nancy Spaans	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,                      As a realtor, I will definitely benefit from the 380 bypass and it will save time and money when I am doing business in that area in the future. I fear for my life every time I have to get on the existing 380 so will definitely save a lot of stress as well. While I am completely in favor of the new bypass, in looking at the options, I would really prefer that Option D is the choice for the road. This option displaces fewer people/animals/lifestyles and is the better route. Option C disrupts the home and community resource of the Veloz family (in particular) along with the bees which are a great environmental resource. It just makes sense to disrupt as little as possible for as many as possible. Thank you for your time and consideration.                      Note: Texas Law requires all real estate licensees give the following information about brokerage services  <a href="https://media.ebby.com/iabs/?0597407">https://media.ebby.com/iabs/?0597407</a>                      Regards,                      Nancy Spaans                      Ebby Halliday Realtors®                      Cell: 214.850.3583                      [REDACTED]</p>	Your comment, support of the project and preference for Segment D is noted.
1605	3/17/2023	Nancy Stogsdill	Online	I strongly oppose the Segment "B" option. The proper route is Segment "A" east of Tucker Hill and this decision should remain as supported by the EIS.	Your comment, support of Segment A, and opposition of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1606	2/16/2023	Nansi Stretcher	Email	<p>Stephen,                      I am writing in opposition to the current alternative to the proposed road bypass for US 380 from Coid Rd to 1827. Specifically, the proposed "Blue Alternative", which includes segments A+E+C, which will result in major disruption to residences, businesses and wildlife.                      Segment C should be avoided because it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Causes more disruptions and displacements: Affects 29 residences, 15 businesses and 7 community resources; compared to 7 residences, 4 businesses, and 0 community resources for Segment D</li> <li>• Destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands within one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• Disturbs more wetland ecosystems that serve as a refuge for wildlife and are a suitable habitat for several threatened species (as determined by TxDOT).</li> <li>• Opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D)</li> <li>• Worse traffic performance as expressed by lower traffic capacity, longer travel times, slower travel speeds, and more elevation changes.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for your consideration,                      Nansi Stretcher</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1607	3/15/2023	Narendra Morum	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Narendra Morum</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1608	3/10/2023	Natalia Abramyan	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Natalia Abramyan	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1609	2/26/2023	Natalie McShane	Online	Oppose segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1610	2/17/2023	Natalie Tramel	Email	Hello, Please consider Route D, and when doing so please consider what the forested area and open land with trees and shrubbery does for the environment, the air quality, the ecosystem of the area. Do not make the same mistakes other counties have. Please consider Route D. Regards, Natalie	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted.
1611	4/20/2023	Nate K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option A puts a freeway within throwing distance of my house. Will ruin all the value we've worked so hard to achieve in McKinney. I don't like the idea of a bypass at all. But option B is my choice	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1612	4/20/2023	Neil J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A. Yes to Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1613	4/3/2023	Nicholas Nordman	Online	I agree with TXDOTS recommended route A over Route B. As a resident of Prosper I feel it's only write to talk about my opposition to Route B. Due to the current building Ladera and Manegate location as well as Founder Academy. Route B would cause the most damage to current and future homes. not to mention taking out and active adult community which services senior Citizens. Also Maingate services veterans and children with disabilities. This is also a vital group that needs these services. Founders Academy would be within a 150 feet of the overpass on route B over Custer next to their playground. On top of this Prosper has outlined their master plan for all roads in prosper and route B would drastically go against all Prosper has done and planned for the future.	Your comment, support of Segment A, and opposition of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.
1614	3/14/2023 3/28/2023	Nicholas Pitts	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1615	2/6/2023	Nick Rodriguez	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1616	4/20/2023	Nick S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	My grandmother is looking at moving in the area and closing on a house and this will cause severe issues for response times to her not with standing it will also depreciate the value of the home tremendously by putting an interstate right next to it. I don't appreciate people getting special treatment just because they're on other boards and they're on the cake because they're getting a rub "money to not have this road put in where it belongs that's on acceptable.	<p>Your comment is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1617	3/10/2023	Nicole Kietzke	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you , Nicole kietzke Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1618	4/20/2023	Nicole M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1619	4/5/2023	Nicole MacFadden	Email	No to 380 bypass on route A 6236 Rocca Valle Dr, McKinney, TX 75071 nicole MacFadden	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1620	3/14/2023	Nicole Rohrer	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Nicole Rohrer 214-208-7588 Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1621	3/9/2023	Nikah Hart	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Nikah Hart Concerned Stonebridge La Cima Haven resident	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1622	3/28/2023	Noel Hernandez	Email	Dear Mr Endres, I have lived in the same home adjacent to HWY 380 for 17 years. Though I have embraced the change and growth, I do not welcome the added noise pollution and traffic the proposed segment A of the 380 bypass. I feel that this route is taking advantage of the current and established neighborhoods while leaving less developed areas to the west unscathed. The effects on the quality of life as well as the reduction in property values of long term residents need to be considered. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely Noel Hernandez Cell: 214-837-8819	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.  Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.  According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1623	4/20/2023	Noelle B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A. YES TO SEGMENT B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1624	4/20/2023	Noemi G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1625	3/7/2023	Nola Miley	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Nola Miley 1701 Woodway Drive McKinney, Texas 76071	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1626	2/25/2023	Norm Counts	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Norm Counts 8700 Grand Haven McKinney Texas 75071	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1627	4/20/2023	Norm H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This is stupid. Build an expressway north of here from Denton to past McKinney then drop down to I30. Another outer loop like 1642 in San Antonio.	Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1628	4/20/2023	Norma A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1629	4/20/2023	Norma K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A , Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1630	4/6/2023	Norwood Wilder	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing regarding my opposition to HWY 380 Brown and Gold alternative routes (Segment B) due to immediate and long-term impacts to the Town of Prosper. Therefore, I fully support the Prosper Council Resolution 2021-34 passed on July 13, 2021, "...CONTINUE SUPPORTING THE TXDOT RECOMMENDED ALIGNMENT AS PRESENTED ON MAY 6, 2019, FOR U.S. HIGHWAY 380 WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE TOWN; STRONGLY OPPOSING ANY PROPOSED ALIGNMENT CHANGE, INCLUDING THE NEW PROPOSED GOLD OR BROWN ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT B ALIGNMENTS AS PRESENTED IN TXDOT' S US 380 EIS SCHEMATIC 30% DESIGN AND WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE TOWN OF PROSPER; OPPOSING SAID ALIGNMENTS BECAUSE THEY ARE IN CONFLICT WITH EXISTING AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ALONG SAID ALTERNATIVES, AS MORE FULLY DESCRIBED IN THIS RESOLUTION; FINDING THAT SAID ALIGNMENTS ARE NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE TOWN' S THOROUGHFARE PLAN AND CURRENT ALIGNMENT OF SAID ROADWAY; MAKING FINDINGS; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE." I request that you also fully support this Resolution by strongly opposing any proposed alignment changes, including the new Gold and Brown alternative segment B alignments. Warmest Regards,</p> <p>Norwood Wilder 2815 Majestic Prince St Celina, TX 75009 CC: Texas House Representatives: Sanford, Holland, and Patterson Texas State Senator Springer Prosper Citizen Group Prosper ISD Board Prosper Town Council Regards, Woody Sent from Woody's iPhone</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS. No final decision regarding an alignment will be made until TxDOT reviews and considers all timely public input.
1631	4/20/2023	Octavian C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1632	2/24/2023	Octavian Covaci	Email	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Opposition to Segment A of the “Blue Alternative” is based on the following facts presented by TxDOT in their February 2023 Announcement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Segment A destroys 27 businesses, 12 displacements and 2 homes currently. It will likely be more than that by the time the project is constructed whereas Segment B destroys no business, 7 displacements, and 5 homes.</li> <li>2. The cost of Segment A right of way acquisition estimated today is \$957.8 million compared to \$888.8 million for Segment B. It is likely to reach more than \$1 billion by the time the project is constructed based on current construction projects which are not counted in the current TxDOT estimates.</li> <li>3. The proposed Blue Alternative which includes Segment A calls for \$120 million from the City of McKinney for right of way acquisition which will be an unplanned tax burden to McKinney taxpayers. The amount of that tax burden quite likely will increase as the cost of ROW acquisitions and related expenses increase.</li> <li>4. Segment A will have a significant detrimental impact on Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill which border the proposed construction of Segment A. It will create major traffic disruption, increased noise, and increased health and environmental problems, not to mention the impact on schools, morning and afternoon traffic, and school zones divided by US380 Segment A.</li> </ol> <p>In addition this will negatively impact my property value and my health due to the noise/air pollution which will dramatically increase since my property is located at the corner of Custer and US380. Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter and my position. Sincerely Octavian Covaci</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Right-of-way acquisition estimates were calculated using Collin County Appraisal District as a guide to come up with square footage cost. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled “The Purchase of Right of Way,” and “Relocation Assistance,” are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT’s (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)–approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>Alternative identified in the draft EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,</li> <li>-depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and</li> <li>-providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</li> </ul> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
1633	4/20/2023	Olga K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1634	3/7/2023	Oliver Cromwell	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. The figures you presented at last years meeting showed Option A was millions of dollars less expensive than Option B. What has changed? At the meeting no one could tell me how or why your figures changed. The only answers or reasons were, "its because of Main Gait" and that Option B went through the "Darling Homestead". These sir, are not reasons to spend millions more of tax payers money and disrupt hundreds more of households and businesses unnecessarily. SBR has over 9500 homes, which is the largest HOA in Texas and many of the residents are prepared to legally oppose this option. Thank You</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Materials presented by TxDOT at the 2022 Spring Public Meeting also show Segment A would cost more than Segment B. Refer to page 7 of the document located here: <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/0135-02-065%20etc_US%20380_SegmentAnalysisBoards_FINAL_3.21.22.pdf">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/0135-02-065%20etc_US%20380_SegmentAnalysisBoards_FINAL_3.21.22.pdf</a>.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1635	2/14/2023	Olivia Zhang	Email	Building this new rode will affect so many things! My friends horse lives in a barn near and it will affect it so much we might need to find a new barn and are we not gonna talk about the oasis. I understand building the basic roads but this is unnecessary and is gonna cause a lot of damage. That's why I am saying I am in favor of route D and opposed to route C	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition to Segment C is noted.
1636	3/5/2023	P Bland	Online	Dear Mr Endres, I'm a resident at Tucker Hill and wrote to you previously outlining what a ridiculous waste of extra money it will be to implement plan A over plan B. Given the decision made, and it's impact on the increased proximity of traffic noise and pollution on Tucker Hill I feel I must insist on a traffic barrier for our neighborhood. Given that cost appears to be only a minor consideration and not a priority (why option A was chosen) there should be no reasonable justification for this not happening. Additionally given that the other side of 380 will have a barrier this seems to be a precedent already in place. Thank you	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.
1637	3/6/2023	Pam Dyson	Email	I live in Willow Wood - 5217 Prospect Street Please reject option C. I'm voting for Option D Sent from my iPad	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1638	4/20/2023	Pam G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Strongly oppose Segment A. Please use option B. Costs less, destroys fewer businesses and homes.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1639	4/20/2023	Pam S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A, yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1640	4/20/2023	Pam S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1641	3/16/2023	Pam S Shapiro	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1642	3/16/2023	Pam Shapiro	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1643	3/9/2023	Pam Smith	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1644	4/20/2023	Pamela N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1645	4/20/2023	Pamela P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please reconsider the extra expense of option A and spare the hard working businessman and women who will be severely impacted. For many Our homes are our investment for our retirement future. Greatly effected home values before and during the projects timeline make a huge negative impact for those that need to consider relocating due to job changes or health reasons. I am very disappointed in the fiscal irresponsibility of the taxes we are being required to cough up. I also don't understand why the proposed ending of the bypass doesn't even make it to the tollway after its completion	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.  It is important to note that TxDOT is conducting another project to the west of the US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 project. TxDOT is developing the schematic design and environmental documentation for a potential freeway along US 380 from Teel Parkway/Championship Dr to west of Lakewood Dr. More information about the project is posted at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri</a> .
1646	3/16/2023	Pamela Persy	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1647	3/15/2023	Pamela Wadsworth	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Pamela Wadsworth	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1648	2/19/2023	Pamela Weslocky	Email	<p>Greetings,                      I am writing to express my concern for the Highway 380 Bypass Route C option. It will be catastrophic. Not only would this option destroy many, many beloved homes and businesses, but human beings, livestock, and other domestic animals, not to mention the surrounding wildlife and beautiful nature that the community enjoys so much. There are historic hundred year old peach, pecan, and plum trees in this section. Hay is grown and cut here for rescue animals who live on this land. We live in a fast-paced world, and it is so wonderful to have an escape as close as McKinney to enjoy. Folks from all over north Texas enjoy what McKinney and the McKinney countryside has to offer. Route C will forever change this, and these communities will suffer, particularly in the areas of Route C containing sections 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, and 421. Many residents from McKinney and other surrounding communities enjoy the ranch life, and families, at-risk youth, and church ministries alike love to learn about nature, wildlife preservation, agriculture, biology, equine management, and more in these areas. Please consider Route D as an alternative to Route C. The environmental impact assessments have already been completed for Route D, which is no easy, quick, or cheap task. There are also substantially less homes and businesses which are affected through Route D. Six community recourses will be affected by Route C, whereas none will be affected by Route D. I certainly hope the right decision will be made, trusting that you are smart, good stewards of the trust and confidence that has been placed in you as representatives of the people, and that you care deeply about the community of McKinney and its surrounding areas. Thank you for your time and consideration. Remember - "C=CATASTROPHIC, D=DECENT."                      Pamela Weslocky                      Collin County Resident                      913 Glen Rose Drive                      Allen, TX 75013</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p>
1649	3/9/2023	Pat Armstrong	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.                      Sent from my iPhone                      Pat Armstrong                      Fathom Realty                      Cell- 214-551-0161                      [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1650	3/6/2023	Pat Justice	Comment Form	I fully agree with the preferred alternative links segment A, E & C.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1651	3/7/2023	Pat Norton	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from Mail for Windows	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1652	4/20/2023	Pat P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Wait and see how the new Dallas Loop performs, before more construction on 380.	Your comment is noted.
1653	4/20/2023	Pat S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I live in Stonebridge Ranch, close to 380. I strongly oppose Option A, for reasons listed by many others. Please vote for Option B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1654	3/15/2023	Pat Wykoff	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Pat WyKoff Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1655	2/6/2023	Patrice Wheeler	Segment C Petition (3)	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1656	4/20/2023	Patricia B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am opposed to Segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1657	3/16/2023	Patricia Brott	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1658	3/23/2023	Patricia Dietz	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, My husband and I have been residents of Prosper since 2012. We love the Whitley Place neighborhood where we live and purposely chose the neighborhood because it was not adjacent to a major highway. We dismissed other neighborhoods because of their proximity to major roadways. We planned ahead and so did Prosper. 380 can be widened. Prosper is a small town in square miles and a bypass through it would greatly diminish the town's appeal to potential residents as well as negatively affect our own property. I oppose the bypass through Prosper because: - It will be very disruptive to our neighborhood as well as others in the area. - The environment will greatly be impacted by noise as well as the pollution associated with a major roadway. - Mane Gait therapeutic riding center will be negatively affected. Horses, children with special needs, as well as veterans go to Mane Gait in part to get away from sensory overload like what is produced by a major highway. - Increased traffic will disrupt our neighborhood schools. - Prosper, which covers a relatively small area by city standards, would be divided by a busy, loud highway. Please keep 380 on 380 or consider Option A so our lovely community will be preserved. Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration. Patricia Dietz 4100 Chimney Rock Dr. Prosper, TX 75078 Sent from my iPad	Your comment and support of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1659	3/27/2023	Patricia Graham	Email	<p>Hello Mr. Endres,                      I am writing as a concerned community member at 2605 Addison St. in Tucker Hill. I do not understand, logically speaking, why Option A was selected as the best solution for Hwy. 380. The cost of Option A vs. Option B should make it prohibitive! It seems McKinney's politicians were out maneuvered by Prosper's politicians, and Prosper was able to protect projects yet to be developed. As a result, the EXISTING neighborhood of Tucker Hill will be significantly impacted by the Hwy. 380 project! I believe the fatal flaw in all of this is the acoustic study done as part of TXDOT's environmental study. It does not truly reflect the amount of noise exposure the Tucker Hill neighborhood will be exposed to each day from 12 lanes of freeway traffic passing by at 70 mph or more! TXDOT's recommendation of Option A over Option B ignores the findings of the environmental study, applies criteria to support this decision (A over B) inconsistently from other sections of the 380 project (C vs D), is fiscally irresponsible to Texas taxpayers, and places an unsupportable financial burden on the City of McKinney and its taxpayers. I implore TXDOT to reconsider the location of the 380 expansion. If, however, Tucker Hill's fate is sealed, I think TXDOT should help bear the cost of moving our front entrance to Stonebridge Dr, by helping put in that road before any road work is started at the 380/Tremont entrance. I also think Tucker Hill should be surrounded appropriately by sound barriers and appropriate landscaping which will protect the neighborhood from all the noise pollution produced by the new 380 freeway! Thank you,                      Patricia Graham                      Sent with Proton Mail secure email.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input and cost are several of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Vegetation such as trees, shrubs and grasses, though very natural and attractive in appearance, offer little reduction in noise levels. Therefore, it is not considered part of the project. However, for beautification purposes, TxDOT does offer green ribbon programs that cities can apply for during future phases of the project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 TIP. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the traffic noise analysis t can be found in the DEIS in Section 3.14.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p>
1660	4/20/2023	Patricia Graham	Email	<p>Hello Mr. Endres, Attached you will find a letter which addresses many reasons why selecting the Segment A option is so flawed. I have made comments and questions throughout the document, and I am requesting a response to each of them from TXDOT. I think this project is a fatal option to the already established Tucker Hill neighborhood, of which I am a resident. It will have a long term negative impact on my community. I moved to this neighborhood after retiring, and spend a great deal of time at home. I enjoy my backyard and walking my dogs daily. These activities will be much less enjoyable with a freeway in my "backyard". I implore TXDOT to abandon the Segment A option. Thank you in advance for your attention to my comments. I also appreciate that you extended the 380 comment period. Sincerely, Patricia Graham</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
1661	2/22/2023	Patricia Strawmyer	Online	<p>The proposal recently released is the best option for the traffic situation on US380 through Prosper and McKinney. Given that Mane Gait, schools and neighborhoods are spared is great! If I recall, this whole issue rose up due to traffic congestion in McKinney at US 380 and I-75. This clearly relieves that and helps the rest of us along US 380.</p>	<p>Your comment and support of the project is noted.</p>
1662	4/20/2023	Patricia W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I opposed the proposed construction of Segment A. It appears the other options will not only cost less but displace fewer residents and places of business. I fear we are too far behind in making wide improvements to 380. Would it not be better to make the outer loop the main road to divert traffic from 380?</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1663	2/6/2023	Patrick / Jenny O'Neal	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1664	4/20/2023	Patrick B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO	Your comment is noted.
1665	4/20/2023	Patrick H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Yes to Segment B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1666	3/20/2023	Patrick Hernandez	Email	Dear Mr. Endres and/or Whom It May Concern, I am a homeowner in McKinney, and I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A for the 380 project. I understand that something needs to be done, but don't understand how Segment A is the solution. Based on my understanding Segment A will affect far more households, especially in the subdivisions of Stonebridge and Tucker Hill, as well as several businesses and has a higher cost. I strongly support the alternate option of Segment B the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. It is the less expensive option for taxpayers, ultimately affects fewer households and businesses and allows for better traffic flow during construction. Sincerely, Patrick Hernandez	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1667	4/20/2023	Patrick S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Stonebridge Ranch is a quiet residential area and the noise, congestion, and \$200,000,000 additional cost for segment A is ridiculous. If Mane gat is an issue find them suitable land to allow them to continue their fine work. Horses do not mind which field to graze. A few million dollars to relocate Mane Gate verses the \$200 million expense of segment A, the noise, and congestion for tens of thousands of Stonebridge Ranch residents a waste of tax payer money. Be financially responsible with our tax dollars and use Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1668	3/14/2023	Patrick Skinner	Email	Stephen, We appreciate what ya'll do for N. Tx mobility! As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. 'YOUR' Independent Tax Advantaged Health Care Financing Consultant! [REDACTED] #972-529-2929 P O Box6383 McKinney, TX 75071	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1669	2/6/2023	Patsy Cave	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1670	4/20/2023	Patsy F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Too expensive and causing many homes to be purchased . Totally opposed to this!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences.
1671	4/20/2023	Paul B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	It's hard to fathom why Segment A is still on the table. Clearly this decision is not being made based on what makes the most sense financially, what is the safest, least disruptive during construction or to the environment and existing businesses.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1672	1/26/2023	Paul Barada	Online and email	My name is Paul Barada and my company name is S. a. Paul Enterprise who owns the land NEC of US Highway 380 and Walnut Grove. I see the Schematic or segment A passing through on my property. If it happens then I would lose high quality tenants and I cannot afford to lose the valuable land. I already designed the multi-tenant shopping center and I have multi-million dollars debt on this property and cannot afford to lose my property. Secondly, I see there are two Segments (alternative routes) like A and B. I think the city of McKinney passed the resolution Segment B last year. I would suggest Segment B is the best option because it will be less displacement for the businesses and residential. I oppose TXDOT's decision if Txdot decide to move Segment A option. Please consider the alternative option B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>Property owners impacted by displacement are entitled to adequate compensation and relocation assistance, among other services. Section 3.1, as well as figures 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 of the DEIS provide additional information about right-of-way acquisition and displacements.</p>
1673	3/7/2023	Paul Bland	Online (1) Email (1)	I have two questions regarding the above: 1. What is the estimated cost of both options A & B? Where can we see how these were calculated and what they were based on and assumptions made re inflation etc. 2. According to TXDOTs explanation of funding (see below) "before the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) can make any financial commitment to developing and delivering a project, available funds must be identified". Can you please confirm that these available funds are in place and where they are coming from? I believe transparency is important as Tax payers will, I assume, be picking up the majority of the costs. Thus it is important to understand the impact of both options of both federal and state taxes. <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/fin/funding-brochure-2022.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/fin/funding-brochure-2022.pdf</a>	Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.  This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1674	4/14/2023	Paul Bland	Email	<p>Dear Mr Endres,                      Thank you for extending the comment period. The DEIS is an incredibly long and technical document and laid out in a manner with is difficult for a layman like me to absorb. This puts me at a disadvantage so extending the time is appreciated and in line with TXDOTs states goal and objective to be transparent, open, and forthright in agency communications. I have re-read the DEIS materials. If there are additional materials I should be referring to as an impacted McKinney resident can you please transparently share what those are and where I can get access.                      Aside from my strong opposition to Segment A, I do not believe the case for this extension has been transparently made or that alternatives have been considered. I still cannot find anything in the DEIS that provides a build v no build analysis. On the contrary in the last few pages of the traffic section (Appendix I) you seem to be challenging something called the “TPP Corridor Analysis Package” and its projections about projected traffic increases. What is the TPP package? Where is the TPP package? On page 5 of the executive summary of the traffic analysis (which is unhelpfully buried at the end of the 296 pages in a way that is not exactly transparent) it also says that traffic volumes for the build v no build case were not provided. Again the focus being on this TPP document. The DEIS appears to do its own analysis of traffic volumes and projections but does not actually spell out a build v no build analysis. So in short, what is the case for build v not build? We seem to be leaping into a huge expense and disruption which increases noise and pollution at my home with no clear articulation of why the build option is so necessary versus a non build option. Furthermore nor does the DEIS appear to consider, present or evaluate any alternative approaches to address the projected traffic growth the DEIS estimates For example, there is absolutely nothing in it which considers greener public transport options. Why has that not been considered I oppose accepting the implied assumption that the only way to address increased road traffic is to increase road capacity. Fait a compli. All the analysis in the DEIS is about road options, with no broader traffic options. In my opinion this evidences a huge bias towards road building and lack of consideration to other transportation alternatives that would not be as damaging to the environment. Furthermore I believe there are flaws in the study regarding noise and air pollution and inappropriate mitigations to these. This narrow proposal is disappointing from TXDOT and its publicly stated mission of being “A forward thinking leader delivering mobility” and “enhancing quality of life for all Texans” TXDOTs goals and objectives also publicly describe “Develop and operate an integrated transport system”. I think Texas residents and Taxpayers deserve that to be the case. An integrated transport system that considers and integrates various transport approaches or using TXDOTs goals and objectives is focused on Mobility. The approach to date does not demonstrate that. It is more akin to a “Texas Department of Roads”. As a resident of Tucker Hill, I thoroughly object to having the environment in which I live bulldozed and my life subjected to the impacts of increased noise and air pollution with no evident consideration of how to mitigate</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p>The Segment Analysis matrix and Figure 2-15 in the DEIS both show travel times, average moving speed, and the level of service for build and no build alternatives considered.no build traffic projection line diagram</p> <p>The TPP package includes historical traffic data and initial traffic growth rates which were used along with other traffic data to develop the Traffic Projection Methodology for this project. More information can be found in Chapter 5 of the TPP Division Manual at <a href="http://onlinemanuals.txdot.gov/txdotmanuals/tpp/traffic.htm">http://onlinemanuals.txdot.gov/txdotmanuals/tpp/traffic.htm</a></p> <p>Regarding the case for build v. no-build alternatives, our analysis showed us that the project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. The analysis also showed us that even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways (US 380 freeway and Collin County Outer Loop) are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>According to Section 2.1.6 of the DEIS, transit as a standalone alternative would not satisfy the identified needs of this project. Also see Sections 2.1.4 Transportation System Management and 2.1.5 Transportation Demand Management.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>these impacts with other transportation options or investments in greener energy like increased charging stations to promote electric vehicle use which would mitigate these environmental impacts. I apologize if my remarks seem critical but the proposal impacts my health and well being. As such I intend opposing this proposal with NEPA which requires that you consider the effects your proposed action may have on the environment, and the related social impacts. I do not agree you have not met that Standard. In relation to your requirement to satisfy NEPA that you have considered the economic impacts, I do not agree that your proposal adequately meets that standard based on the significant extra expense associated with Segment A, versus B and the 15 existing businesses it displaces versus none in B. Thank you for your time and inclusion of these public comments.</p> <p>Paul Bland 2809 Majestic Avenue McKinney Sent from my iPhone</p>	
1675	3/18/2023	Paul Borchard	Online	<p>My full comment is attached. It is only 5 pages in length including a map. Statement of position: Segment C affects our family farm by destroying the peaceful setting. It affects us most by destroying the homes of several of our neighbors and disrupting the community of neighbors. Many neighbors will be forced to move; others will be on the opposite side of a freeway.</p> <p><i>Full comment and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p> <p><i>Full comment and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
1676	4/20/2023	Paul C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Resident of the Tucker Hill community which stands to be impacted negatively by option A.	Your comment is noted.
1677	4/20/2023	Paul C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>This route makes zero sense. The route that needs to be considered is one that starts at the DNT or even further west. Pursuing any of the currently proposed EIS routes is akin to kicking the can down the road and failing to acknowledge the growth west of Custer that is happening. With the new PGA, Fields, and Universal projects the traffic will just increase and TXDOT will have to revisit this again in 5 years to address this. Do it right the first time and save the taxpayers, home owners, and businesses the hassle.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>TxDOT is also conducting a schematic design and environmental study for US 380 to the east from Teel Parkway/Championship Drive to west of Lakewood Drive in Collin and Denton Counties . Routes being considered include a freeway along the existing US 380. More information about that project can be found at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri</a>.</p>
1678	4/20/2023	Paul C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1679	4/19/2023	Paul Campbell	Email	<p>As a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of political maneuvering, campaigning, and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait that ostensibly has swayed TxDOT's position, and I publicly condemn these actions as unethical. Segment A for the 380 bypass, TxDOT will do harm to a significant percentage of McKinney residents and will demonstrate significant fiscal irresponsibility. This decision is made more egregious with the existence of a viable lower impact. This does not make sense. Please do not proceed with this project without a rigorous study of all pollutants that cause harm to humans and a rigorous health impact analysis to understand both current and future. The pollution appendices are missing critical analyses and portions are invalid as presented. This project should not proceed until those egregious omissions and errors are corrected. Tucker Hill is a very unique front porch community. We spend a lot of time on our porches and walking the neighborhood. I am 74 and have had numerous health problems since returning from my service in the Air Force in Viet Nam. The worst problem is my lungs probably due to exposure to agent orange. I've had numerous episodes of pneumonia and try and protect my lungs and upper respiratory tract at all cost. Tucker Hill was suppose to be my last home. Can u guarantee that 380 will Not be detrimental to my health and well being after construction and during construction due to the excessive environmental pollution? Have you researched the correlation between noise and mental and physical health? This can be very stressful and detrimental to everyone's health and well being. I'm also concerned about emergency vehicle access to Tucker Hill. Can you guarantee that Stonebridge will be completed before any construction on 380 Is started in front of Tucker Hill? Why can't the outer loop be used as a solution? Wouldn't it make more sense to connect to NDT and 35??? If the 380</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. TxDOT conducted a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis including benzene</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>segment A is selected and all the studies regarding our health are completed you must promise a depressed 380 in front of Tucker hill with large sound barriers. I can't even imagine how loud the noise will be. Why are we the only neighborhood that will be affected on 2 sides by 380 Bypass and flood plains on the north side with no way to exit the neighborhood I'm the rear. Thanks in advance for your consideration to all my questions.                      Paul Campbell                      [REDACTED]                      Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>and VOCs (Section 3.12.3 of the DEIS), and a Carbon Monoxide Traffic Air Quality analysis (Section 3.12.2 of the DEIS), included in Appendix P of the DEIS. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 TIP.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1680	2/27/2023	Paul Champagne	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, I'm confused with the decision to proceed with the route (blue) selected for this project. Specifically, I have lived in McKinney for 17 years and travel US 380 daily in my work commute from Stonebridge Ranch to the DNT. The amount of growth and increasing congestion that is occurring west of Custer Rd is massive and with all of the growth directly north as well as the surrounding areas south and southwest it will only continue. Projects such as the new PGA HQ and the recently announced Fields/Universal developments will bring this section of US380 to a crawl. Starting this project as far east as Ridge road does not address that growth and is akin to kicking the can. TXDOT will have no choice but to conduct another costly study and project in 5-10 years to address that segment of US380 and by then there will be less options to bypass that area due to the growth. Why haven't you instead considered a route that starts at or near the DNT where it intersects US380 and addresses the growth now instead of creating a band aid solution to just a portion of the route? Thanks in advance for your consideration.</p> <p>Paul Champagne 469-219-9157</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north than the Preferred Alternative did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p> <p>TxDOT is conducting another project to the west of the US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 project. TxDOT is developing the schematic design and environmental documentation for a potential freeway along US 380 from Teel Parkway/Championship Dr to west of Lakewood Dr. More information about the project is posted at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-teel-parkwaychampionship-drive-to-west-of-lakewood-drive-prosperfri</a>.</p>
1681	4/20/2023	Paul D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1682	2/11/2023	Paul G.	Online	<p>The 380 Bypass should not cut into Prosper! It should be north of Frontier. The bypass in McKinney goes North and should continue east to west on the north side of Prosper or into Celina. The current 380 in Prosper needs to be slower and have additional lights, just like it is in McKinney. People on 380 need to slow down! Put a bypass north for people to go faster. Ultimately you are accommodating traffic from Celina anyways.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.</p> <p>It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p> <p>The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.
1683	3/21/2023	Paul Staffan	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, I oppose the segment C on the Blue and Brown alternatives of the 380 Bypass routes. I do however support segment D on the purple and gold routes. This segment appears to displace fewer homes. <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/0135-02-065%20etc_US380_Roll%20Plot%201.15.2021.pdf">http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/0135-02-065%20etc_US380_Roll%20Plot%201.15.2021.pdf</a> . Can you please use your legislative authority to help make this change? Thank you Paul Staffan McKinney, TX 75071	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. A Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
1684	4/20/2023	Paul W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I believe Segment B would cause less disruption to people, homes and businesses. I request you support option B.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1685	2/22/2023	Paula Echeverry	Online	oppose C 100% I Support option D	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1686	3/16/2023	Paula Maddox	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1687	3/13/2023 3/15/2023	Peggy & Bogdan Djurdjulov	Email (4)	Thanks for explaining some of the factors affecting decisions on noise. Please send the link for the noise analysis covering our homes on Grassmere which will now have an above ground 380 segment near our homes where none existed before. Thank you. Peggy & Bogdan Djurdjulov 2320 Grassmere Lane Tucker Hill Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and concern about traffic noise is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1688	3/7/2023	Peggy and Bogdan Djurdjulov	Email	<p>We live on 2320 Grassmere Lane, McKinney. We understand Route A is now the preferred route although route B was always a better alternative from a cost and impact perspective. Having said that we'd like to know the following: How many feet will it be from our home to route A on the north east side. Will the route that passes here be a raised highway or ground level. Is it accurate that money was paid (from and to Billingsley and Southern Land) to move this route 900' closer to Tucker Hill on the eastern side. Who approved that? It's much more detrimental to the homes on Grassmere Lane and 900' makes it worse. What is the specific environmental impact of increased decibels and pollution on the homes closest to the Route A proposal. We'd like to see how this was conducted and estimated. We understand there is opposition from TxDOT for sound barriers to protect Tucker Hill on all sides - why. Importantly how will TxDOT remunerate individual homeowners for required soundproofing and pollution mitigation required during both the construction and ongoing traffic this will create. Why weren't alternative sites pursued to move ManeGait to open up route B as an alternative. How does TxDOT resolve what appears to be a conflict of interest between the Darling ownership of ManeGait and their interest in buildable land for Darling homes. How was the purported "overwhelming" input for route A from Prosper residents audited? Why wasn't this input announced as an actual "vote" for route A or B. We went to the meetings and provided our input for route B immediately. How sure are you Prosper's inputs were not bots versus verified resident input. Further a straw vote is not the way a project of this magnitude should be made. We are very concerned about the impact of the decisions and how they were made. So far we have not gotten full disclosure on specifics. This appears right now to be just "tough luck" for Tucker Hill residents. We hope this will change before the first shovel appears. We look forward to the answers for our concerns.</p> <p>Peggy &amp; Bogdan Djurdjulov 2320 Grassmere Lane, McKinney</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The previous design was approximately 1,065 feet from the address you provided to the freeway frontage roads. With the design shift, it is approximately 1,000 feet away from the address provided.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. Results of public and stakeholder input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p>
1689	4/20/2023	Peggy B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A. Yes to Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1690	2/18/2023	Peggy Brown	Email	I am a resident of Collin County and I am opposed to the route C path of the new McKinney bypass as it will affect people's homes and pastures and forest area full of animals! I support Route D to be the better less invasive route with less disruption to peoples homes!! Thank you for your help in deciding the path of this project!! Peggy Brown	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1691	3/12/2023	Peggy Click	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Peggy Click 7604 Harbor Town Drive, McKinney Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1692	4/20/2023	Peggy D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>The B route is less expensive and reduces the impact on existing homes and businesses. B can be built on undeveloped land which is a more rational solution.</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.</p>
1693	4/20/2023	Peggy Djurdjulov	Online (1) Email (1)	<p>We have submitted additional comments on the Segment A selection vs B now that we know how much and how close this 12-land expressway will be to us. We are elderly and have health issues. We moved here to be in a quiet neighborhood (when we arrived in 2008 380 was only 4 lanes) Now it will be 12 and will surround our home on 3 sides. I hope TxDOT reconsiders segment B and based on the facts it should. We appreciate your support. I've attached what I sent.</p> <p>Respectfully, Peg Djurdjulov 2320 Grassmere Lane, Tucker Hill [REDACTED]</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
1694	2/6/2023	Peggy Prince	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1695	4/20/2023	Penelope H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Vote No	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1696	3/8/2023	Pete Carrell	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,                      I hope you are doing well. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks for your assistance.                      Pete Carrell                      972.742.5302</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1697	2/20/2023	Peter John	Online	Why wouldn't you propose the 380 Bypass along the New Outer loop in Celina much more space and options without disturbing current residents and their lively hood. Leave 380 alone and slow it down with more lights and lower speed limit.	<p>Your comment is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>
1698	2/26/2023	Peter Lam	Online	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1699	2/6/2023	Peter Linke	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1700	4/17/2023	Peter Nugent	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1701	3/12/2023	Peter Stuckmann	Online	<p>TxDOT has unfortunately selected the Blue alternative for the highway 380 expansion/bypass project. To my understanding, it seems TxDOT has made the illogical choice due to a variety of reasons. The blue alternative, specifically segment A of such alternative, is more costly than segment B by approximately \$200 million, is more environmentally impactful than segment B, affects more homes and businesses, future and existing developments (some of which TxDOT fails to consider), and decreases the quality of life for the 36,000 homeowners in Stonebridge Ranch by increasing noise in park available to all Stonebridge Residents, residents of Tucker Hill, and the future residents of the Chase at Wilson Creek Multi Family homes which TxDOT fails to recognize broke ground before the new year and will displace ALL of those residents. Therefore, TxDOT must reconsider choosing an alternative with Segment B, Choose the No build alternative, or Modify Segment A so more of it will be below grade. The Blue Alternative has consistently been one of the more costly options as TxDOT has gone through the various phases of evaluating the project alternatives. Based on the Draft Environmental Impact Study, the Blue Alternative costs approximately \$200 million more than the Brown alternative. Far more than alternatives that include segment A. TxDOT has a fiduciary duty to be</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>As a part of this project, future developments were closely tracked by</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>fiscally responsible when evaluating project alternatives. According to the environmental draft study, the Blue alternative is more environmentally impactful as it runs adjacent to the LaCima pond and Park which currently flows directly across US 380 into a reservoir on the other side of the Highway. Construction would permanently affect the flow of water between the LaCima pond and the reservoir on the other side of 389. This could have significant impacts on the wildlife that inhabit LaCima pond and park, as well as reduce the number of fish in the pond, which would also reduce the quality of fishing in the pond which happens frequently. In addition, the elevated highway would increase noise by 2-3 decibels by the pond which is above TXDOT's threshold for a sound barrier, but TXDOT states that it will not install a sound barrier to prevent noise in the park, thus negatively impacting the park. TXDOT cites that the reason the park is not of higher consideration is because it is a private park. While this is true, the park is open to the 36000 residents of Stonebridge Ranch, which is a greater number of people than the neighboring town of Prosper. In addition there is no security measure stopping the public from entering the park, and the homeowners association does not stop the public from utilizing the park. In fact, the park is a popular spot for people to take pictures. The 8 lane highway would negatively impact the entire community as it would ruin pictures, and thus get rid of a spot where the public takes pictures. According to TXDOT the blue alternative will displace more businesses, particularly around the intersection of Custer and 380. Segment A displaces 14 more businesses than segment B not including future developments. This will reduce the number of retailers and restaurants that residents have access to, and put people out of employment. In addition TXDOT says that segment A impacts less future residential development. This could not be farther from the truth. TXDOT fails recognize the new multi family development called the Chase at Wilson Creek, which segment A will completely destroy. This project got approval from the city council back in September of 2022, and began clearing land in December or January. The project is set to be completed in may of 2024, which is before TXDOT anticipates to begin construction on the proposed alternative, meaning that the alternative will displace all of the residents on the 27 acre multi family property. Most likely, the development will serve lower income families, something that is lacking in this area at the moment. Therefore TXDOT is misinforming the residents by not including up to date information on the status of the project, and thus gives deference to the future single family development in Prosper which serves wealthier residents, while displacing lower income residents in the Chase at Wilson Creek.</p>	<p>TxDOT and discussed with the City of McKinney and Town of Prosper as well as developers including those developing the Chase at Wilson Creek property. Appendix S of the DEIS details indirect and cumulative effects, which includes details of the future development plans considered by TxDOT. A development heat map can be found at the Public Hearing website as well.</p> <p>TxDOT designed the project so that LaCima pond will continue to be connected to the Wilson Creek Tributary to the north.</p> <p>LaCima Park was modeled as a park (NAC C) in the traffic noise analysis. Because a traffic noise impact would result at that location a barrier analysis was performed. However, the barrier was found to not be feasible. Reference abatement analysis on page 24 of Appendix R for barrier A0-2.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1702	2/16/2023	Petition from Residents and Businesses in Opposition of Segment C	Paper Petition	<p>Oppose C (Catastrophe) and Support D (Decent) - C divides residential and farming/ranching communities. C affects and displaces more residences (29 for C, 7 for D), businesses (15 for C, 4 for D), and Community Resources (7 for C, 0 for D). C damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands. C disturbs wetlands and suitable habitat for threatened species (determined by TxDOT). C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D). C has worse traffic performance: Lower traffic capacity, longer travel times, slower travel speeds, and more elevation changes.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1703	3/7/2023	Philip and Pamela Mitchell	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,                      Philip and Pamela Mitchell                      608 Rosebury Circle                      McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1704	3/11/2023	Philip Charles	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres:                      I will not iterate the arguments for and against the two proposals advanced for the 380 Bypass, as you have been inundated with same. However, I appreciate the opportunity to add my opinion to those supporting Option B. Thank you for your favorable consideration of Option B as both meeting the needs and alleviating the concerns of the Stonebridge Ranch citizenry.                      Sincerely,                      Philip Charles                      2548 Dunbar Drive                      McKinney, TX 75072                      [REDACTED]</p>	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1705	3/16/2023	Philip Main	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1706	4/20/2023	Philip N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I don't understand what makes Segment A "preferred" by TxDOT. What's the preference criteria? Increased cost of \$150M, impact to 57 existing homes and businesses, accommodate relatively small corner of Prosper. Keep it simple, less expensive and less disruptive - No to Segment A, YES to Segment B.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1707	4/20/2023	Phillip F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Fiscal Responsibility is needed here. Choose Option B over A because it saves hundred of millions of dollars, destroys less business, or revisit and make new alternatives.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1708	4/20/2023	Phillip F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Want TxDot to use State Funds in the most efficient and effective manner. Save the \$200 million and reconsider the option B over Option A.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1709	2/27/2023	Phillip Falk	Online	I worked for Chairman of Fortune 500 company as a mergers and acquisitions analyst. Never in my career has a non common sense alternative been chosen over a more practical, less expensive option. No surveys were mailed out to every affected citizen yet I have been hearing about the higher percentage of people voted for one option over another. This was not a fair representation of the community. I moved into my house April 18, 2022 and never heard one word of this issue from realtor or builder. \$100 to \$200 million of extra cost is significant. Common sense, not politics needs to win the day. I'm not against progress but I am against wasteful spending. Time to Reconsider A versus B.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.  Results of public and stakeholder input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . Notices for all US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study Public meetings and hearings (conducted from 2016-2020) and for this EIS project have been mailed to adjacent property owners and residents who live within a half mile of the proposed project and ads were published in multiple local newspapers.
1710	3/6/2023	Phillip Falk	Email	Stephen Public Hearing Comment Form 2751 Majestic Avenue McKinney, TX. 75071 I'm in the Commercial Real Estate and Securities Business. I will always endorse the most effecient/effective use of our State Funds. How about building us a Combined HW380 + Bypass & Include a Beltway For Bikes & exercise like the AtlantA or the Miami Beltway in option A. That way -> In addition to the massive spending on Hwy 380, we could enter the 2030's For Good Health & Excercise. B is better option over A Because it sAves \$200 million +, which can be used For Healthy Living.	Your comment is noted. Implementation of the Blue Alternative would comply with TxDOT's Bicycle Accommodation Design Guidance, which also implements the USDOTs and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)'s policies regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. Shared Use Paths (SUPs) built along the outside of the frontage roads would link to existing sidewalk systems and the components of McKinney's City-Wide Trail Master Plan and Prosper's Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan and Hike & Bike Trail Master Plan as they are implemented. The design of the SUPs would comply with TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, guidelines developed by AASHTO, and with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Providing SUPs with connectivity to existing and planned bicycle and pedestrian systems would comply with the USDOT's policy to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into transportation systems. The SUPs would also support multi-modal use of the corridor for those residents that do not have access to a vehicle. More information about Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities can be found in Section 3.5 of the EIS.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1711	3/9/2023	Phillip Falk	Email	<p>Stephen My Public Hearing Comments Form Phillip Falk Tucker Hill Homeowner 2751 Majestic Avenue McKinney, TX. 75071</p> <p>As a Tucker Hill McKinney resident, I cannot believe that cronyism is the determining factor in the 380-overpass decision. Option B is the smartest and most fiscally responsible decision. Tucker Hill, Stonebridge, Wren Creek and other neighborhoods that will be directly impacted, did not have fair representation in early public comment. Bill Darling's financial campaign contributions to 4 of 7 city council members and city mayor has influenced them to not push back, which in turn will cost tax payers substantially more money. When clearly looking at all the factors, Option B is the best route as it is less expensive, has a lower environmental impact, improves traffic congestion and minimizes the number of businesses impacted and displaced. A bypass or loop is created to divert traffic to lesion overall congestion. If that is the true objective of the project, then you would want traffic off of 380 as quickly as possible. Option A keeps the bypass on 380 longer, which in turn creates more traffic congestion. This is the opposite reason for the entire bypass project. It also utilizes substantially more taxpayer money to fund.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>Results of public and stakeholder input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>
1712	3/7/2023	Phillip Jaubert	Email	<p>Mr. Enders.</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Phillip Jaubert 972-523-2666 [REDACTED] Linkedin profile</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1713	3/16/2023	Phillip Jaubert	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1714	4/20/2023	Piotr L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Do not destroy Stonebridge!	Your comment is noted.
1715	4/20/2023	Polly D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I'm in favor of Segment B that benefits the homeowners.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1716	4/5/2023	Prd D	Online	Hi our house is located right behind sector E blue alternative plan adjacent to Heatherwood community, please consider constructing wall between proposed highway along side the Heatherwood community fence to reduce noise , since more than 20+ house are located just with in 100 ft from highway which will cause a lot of noise and affect our family having orders and children.	Your comment and concern about traffic noise is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Heatherwood neighborhood currently has a brick privacy wall or barrier of some type that would reduce noise; therefore the area does not meet feasibility and reasonableness requirements. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.
1717	3/26/2023	Quan and Susie Nguyen	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Quan and Susie Nguyen	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1718	4/20/2023	R D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1719	2/18/2023	R.O.	Online	Please approve segment A. I live on north Custer Road and support the blue proposed alignment.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1720	2/17/2023	Rachana Patel	Online	Option c would affect front half of my property which we used to provide for our animals. There are various species of migratory birds that will be affected as well. The drawing has changed from previous and is shifted entirely towards our property leaving the other side completed untouched. We are only one of few farms left. With the focus on more home grown, local products, it defeats the purpose of having a major highway going thru our farm. Other point i would like to make is the future traffic from McKinney going east. With increasing population, it would bottleneck on 1827 so it would defeat the purpose of this since we will be back to square one. I do not think any options are ideal for the amount of people and traffic that is and will be in the county. Just as Dallas had to revamp 635 and 75, this is something that requires more than 5-10 year projection. If there was a decision that need to be made, option d would be a better option since it effects less people and farms.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. TxDOT is also conducting a schematic design and environmental study for US 380 in Princeton. Routes being considered include a new location freeway to the north of Princeton. More information about that project can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a> .
1721	2/17/2023	Rachel Smith	Online	i am against route C as it interferes with the nature and surrounding ranches that have flourished on this land for generations. Route D goes through a flood plane and does not disrupt the surrounding enviroment so catastrophically. The correct path forward is obviously NOT C!	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.
1722	4/20/2023	Rachel G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to A, Yes to B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1723	3/16/2023	Rachel Gomes	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1724	2/6/2023	Rachel Oppenheimer	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1725	4/20/2023	Rachel R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner in McKinney Texas I oppose segment A. I support the segment B route.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1726	2/16/2023	Rachel Smith	Paper form	I am against Route C and it adversely affects the surrounding nature and environment and all of the ranches that have been thriving on this land for generations. Clearly, logically, Route D is preferred as it is a flood plain that would not be so incredibly and uselessly displaced. No C! My family would be devastated.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted. Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.
1727	4/20/2023 4/19/2023	Rachel Thompson	Online (1) Email (1)	<p>Please see uploaded document for comments. To whom it may concern: I am a homeowner in Tucker Hill. I live in one of the houses that backs up to 380. I can see 380 from my dining room and hear 380's traffic from every room in my house. I am extremely concerned about the noise and air pollution and the fact that there is no sound wall/pollution barrier in the plan for Tucker Hill with the preferred selection of Segment A. I have a 2 year old daughter who currently refuses to go outside into our backyard during rush hour because of the traffic noise. TXDOT's own analysis even concludes that my house and my neighbor's houses will suffer from increased noise pollution. Further, with the destruction of the trees in front of Tucker Hill, there will be even less protection from the noise and pollution than we currently have. As detailed below, I do not believe that a sufficient analysis has been performed regarding the health and safety of residents during construction and afterwards if Segment A is chosen.</p> <p>In addition, once my daughter is school-aged, she will be zoned to Prosper ISD. I am extremely concerned about the community cohesion between Tucker Hill and Auburn Hills. Tucker Hill will be truly isolated. The need to walk over an 8 lane highway just to access the rest of my city makes that apparent.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Access to Tucker Hill would be maintained along the Preferred Alternative including an at-grade connection at Tremont Boulevard over the depressed section of the new freeway and a connection to existing US 380 east of Tucker Hill.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	
1728	3/7/2023	Rachell Hansen	Email	Dear Mr. Enders, Please NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1729	3/15/2023	Rachelle Mossinger	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing to you to share my STRONG opposition to the bypass and Option B running through Prosper. I am a resident of Whitley Place and have been for the last seven years and disagree with the bypass running through Prosper for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12+ lanes going right through Prosper (8 lanes &amp; 4+ access lanes on either side) with the magnitude equal to US 75, located just south of Founders Academy</li> <li>• US 380 Bypass Segment B options + approved Collin Outer Loop (4-6 lanes) just north would sandwich NE &amp; SE Prosper in between 2 major highway thoroughfares</li> <li>• Directly affects and disruptive to numerous neighborhoods: Whitley Place, Whispering Farms, Brookhollow, Christie Farms, Rhea Mills, Gentle Creek, Amberwood, Ladera, etc.</li> <li>• Prosper properly planned for expansion (380 can be widened!). If other towns didn't plan this can't be put on Prosper</li> <li>• Directly impacts multiple schools in Prosper ISD: Cockrell Elementary   Rogers Middle School   Walnut Grove High School and Founders Classical Academy and student drivers</li> <li>• Increased Traffic and Noise</li> <li>• Materially impacts ManeGait and the wonderful therapy they provide to children, veterans, and our disabled community</li> <li>• Exorbitant costs of acquiring rights of way, adverse environmental impacts, wetland mitigation</li> <li>• This design does not make for an acceptable proposal nor effective use of taxpayer money</li> <li>• School buses having to go on a highway to take kids to school / young drivers for the high school having to deal with highways and high speeds</li> <li>• Significant environmental impact: pollution, emissions, &amp; poor air quality</li> <li>• Safety of our citizens and students</li> <li>• Decreased home values and overall desire of area</li> <li>• Massive utility relocations that are critical to Prosper's infrastructure</li> <li>• Substantial lost tax revenue to the Town and Prosper ISD</li> </ul> <p>In closing, I highly oppose Option B and want 380 to stay on 380 or Option A to be considered.</p> <p>Rachelle Mossinger 4060 Chimney Rock Drive Prosper, Texas 75078 Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which does not include Segment B. It does include Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1730	2/24/2023	Raechel Conner	Email	Hello, My name is Raechel & Mike Conner. My sister owns the property on 2500 FM 2933. We have visited this property many times & we do not agree with the route that will destroy it. Please consider route D. I am told that route D will disrupt less homes. Thank you for your consideration. Raechel & Mike Conner	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.
1731	4/20/2023	Rafael S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Stonebridge Ranch is a 30 year community with more than 9200 homes and 32000 residents who bought in this community because of the green space and peaceful lifestyle, option B effects far fewer people and businesses. Please select option B or something further north where and is just being developed.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
1732	2/17/2023	Rajiv Nayar	Online	No McKinney biomass through Prosper! Come on txdot. Hold McKinney accountable. We need to keep 380 on 380 and leave Mane Gate PISD schools, Founders, and the Prosper families alone.	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
1733	2/6/2023	Rally Motorcycle Service	Segment C Petition	Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3 1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative) 2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons: - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1734	3/10/2023	Ralph Easterwood	Email	<p>I am emailing concerns over the US 380 Bypass NE of McKinney Texas, I oppose Route C.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>2 Route C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 151% more acres of grassland and prairie</li> <li>3 Route C divides residential and farming/ranching communities</li> <li>4 Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources.</li> </ol> <p>These are just a few reasons why I am opposed to Route C. Regards, Ralph Easterwood</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>
1735	4/20/2023	Randall B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A. YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1736	3/31/2023	Randy & Nancy Robertson	Email	<p>In the US 380 Bypass project (Coit Road to FM 1827), TxDOT has proposed the construction of Segment A which will cause untold damages to our Stonebridge Ranch lifestyle.                      Dear Mr. Endres;                      As homeowners and citizens of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, we understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. Our home is right behind the sound wall on 380 near Stonebridge Dr. so we will be directly impacted by Segment A if chosen. We strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,                      Randy &amp; Nancy Robertson                      7816 Harvest Hill Lane                      McKinney, TX 75071</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1737	4/20/2023	Randy N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Money to taxpayers is my concern. Route should go where the cost is less.	Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.
1738	3/21/2023	Randy Shaver	Online	Why would segment A be selected over segment B when it almost \$200,000,000 more. Even the shift is around \$100,000,000 more. A lot of the development over the last 5 years will need to be relocated. Property values for Stonebridge ranch, Tucker hill and Ridgecrest will be impacted negatively.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
1739	4/20/2023	Reba C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A - YES TO SEGMENT B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1740	3/15/2023	Rebecca	Email	<p>Hello Stephen,                      I am writing because my community and I strongly object the proposed route "A" 380 bypass construction. It is the most disruptive route to the surrounding residents and makes no sense financially. Please understand this project has caused undeserved stress on these affected residents. We moved to this location for some peace and quiet, we surely did not sign up for noise disturbance to be at our backyard. This project will cause severe loss on our property value and sense of community to these subdivisions. A lot of us have attended the meeting on February 16th, but there were only maps showing proposed routes, video showing the plan and poster boards showing noise barrier plans. There was no one to hear the public opinions and voices. Although I understand the anticipated traffic increase on 380 due to the growth, Please consider other better routes that is not as disruptive to the community. Thank you,                      Timberridge subdivision resident                      Rebecca                      Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Timberridge subdivision does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements for a noise barrier.</p> <p>Project team members were available during the in-person February 16</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					Public Hearing. Additionally, this US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.
1741	4/20/2023	Rebecca B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please don't disrupt our life with this project. We like our community as is. This project does not belong in this area. It is too close to residents that live in this neighborhood. NO to Segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1742	2/21/2023	Rebecca Cormier	Online	<p>I am a lifetime resident of Collin County and part of why I remain here is the access to our parks and forests. Please implement option D as originally planned and not C. C will really harm the largest remaining forests in Collin County. This will destroy over 100% more acres of prairies and over 70% more acres of forest and wetlands than C. This option will not only displace residents and businesses, but destroy habitats for beavers, otters, turtles, birds, frogs, and other wildlife at a time when we are all realizing their vital benefit to our ecosystem. We will lose a large hunk of the areas that make our county unique and the ability for younger generations to enjoy and learn from these areas and wildlife.</p> <p>I stand by Texas Parks and Wildlife when I say I am strongly opposed to option C and hope you will reconsider in favor of D as once this harm is done, it is non-reversible.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however,</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.
1743	3/26/2023	Rebecca Crookston	Online	In August 2022 we signed a contract and paid earnest money to build a home in Erwin Farms. Only later did we learn that TxDOT was proposing an 8-lane highway (+ 4 access lanes) directly north of our neighborhood, 2000 feet from our new home. Nowhere in the area are there signs of the proposed highway. This also was not addressed by our builder. Why is TxDOT building a highway through new neighborhoods and why is development continuing these areas? The 380 bypass could be built farther north where there are fewer homes and neighborhoods. Or the Collin County Outer Loop could be finished and used to divert traffic from Highway 380. I don't believe that TxDOT, the city of McKinney, or the developers are acting in good faith or are concerned about the well-being of the citizens of the affected areas.	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. While the project would run adjacent to the Erwin Farms neighborhood, it would not go through it. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Multiple notices have been sent to property owners and current residences since the first US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study Public Meeting in Spring 2018.</p> <p>There are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>
1744	2/17/2023	Rebecca Easterwood	Online	I am very against route C. It makes no sense. It displaces too many established ranches. It's very much against McKinneys, "Unique by nature" motto. Go with route D	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1745		Rebecca Easterwood	Comment Form	I oppose route C! Please go with another route! It displaces many working ranches! They say our comments don't matter! I want to save my ranch! You will take 1/2 of it!	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1746	2/6/2023	Rebecca Esterwood/Gary Sanders	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1747	4/20/2023	Rebecca G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I don't know why anyone would choose to construct a massive freeway like this on an already existing high traffic road. Construction will cause tremendous interruptions and additional traffic. Not to mention the expense and what about all the businesses that are currently undergoing construction in the path? One established business already has scheduled their shutdown. Also, Tucker Hill is a unique community that people love and this project will have numerous negative effects. I'm afraid for the change in value of our homes and how this will change what people love about Tucker hill. No to segment A!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.
1748	4/20/2023	Rebecca J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is not only less expensive but also less disruptive to communities that have been here for decades. Use the option that is available and saves tax payer dollars	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1749	4/20/2023	Rebecca K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The other routes cost less and impact far fewer reside. Please do not ruin our neighborhoods!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1750	4/17/2023	Rebecca Kleinman	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I live in one of the neighborhoods where you want to put a freeway. My 89 year old mother also owns a home in our neighborhood. We have lived in McKinney for more than a decade. But this threatens our way of life, our peace, our homes. What on earth are you thinking? Would you raise your kids next to a freeway? Would you purchase a home next to a highway like this? This will pollute our air. It will increase noise. It will cause our property values to plummet. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars. It will cause disruptions and delay for years. It will negatively impact several local schools. It is a BAD idea that must be stopped. Please, just say NO to Segment A! As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch and Auburn Hills residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. The facts about Segment A and Segment B:</p> <p>My opposition to Segment A of the "Blue Alternative" is based on the following facts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Segment A destroys 27 businesses, 12 displacements and 2 homes currently. It will likely be more than that by the time the project is constructed whereas Segment B destroys no business, 7 displacements,</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Right-of-way acquisition estimates were calculated using Collin County Appraisal District as a guide to come up with square footage cost. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified;</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>and 5 homes.                      2. The cost of Segment A right of way acquisition estimated today is \$957.8 million compared to \$888.8 million for Segment B. It is likely to reach more than \$1 billion by the time the project is constructed based on current construction projects which are not counted in the current TxDOT estimates.                      3. The proposed Blue Alternative which includes Segment A calls for \$120 million from the City of McKinney for right of way acquisition which will be an unplanned tax burden to McKinney taxpayers. The amount of that tax burden quite likely will increase as the cost of ROW acquisitions and related expenses increase.                      4. Segment A will have a significant detrimental impact on Stonebridge Ranch, Auburn Hills and Tucker Hill which border the proposed construction of Segment A. It will create major traffic disruption, increased noise, and increased health and environmental problems, not to mention the impact on schools, morning and afternoon traffic, and school zones divided by US380 Segment A.                      Please select Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. DO NOT implement segment A. Thank you for your consideration. Best,                      Rebecca Kleinman                      5504 Fulham Lane                      McKinney, TX 75071                      See PDF for images.</p>	<p>however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:                      -building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,                      -depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and                      -providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</p>
1751	2/27/2023	Rebecca L. Easterwood	Email	<p>Good day,                      I am emailing with my concerns over the US 380 Bypass NE of McKinney Texas, I oppose Route C. The attached map depicts the two segments (Route C and D) under consideration for Focus Area 3: SH5 to FM 1827 of the TxDot US 380 Coit Road to FM 1827 Draft EIS. The locations of proximate residences, businesses and community resources are mapped out.                      1. Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County                      2. Route C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 151% more acres of grassland and prairie                      3. Route C divides residential and farming/ranching communities                      4. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources.                      Above are just a few reasons why I am opposed to Route C. You can see the complete listings of C vs. D on the attached map. Please help us in choosing route D over route C. Regards,                      Rebecca L. Easterwood - resident of affected ranchland of route C.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>
1752	2/18/2023	Rebekah Cooksey	Online	I support the blue alternative that is currently the "preferred" schematic shown. Thank you for keeping 380 on 380 through Prosper and protecting ManeGait.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1753	3/30/2023	Reddy Tummala	Email	<p>Dear Texas Department of Transportation, McKinney, and Prosper, Plan A is not good because it would require the highway to go through just one city at a higher expense to the taxpayers and would not bypass as much of the major roadway. This plan would also force the road to run from north to south, which is not optimal for relieving traffic from east to west. Furthermore, Plan A would cut off the entire community of Tucker Hill from the city, and displace more residences, which would have a significant impact on the community and environment. On the other hand, Plan B is a better option because it would mostly go through McKinney and run through Plano for about a mile. Plan B would bypass highway 380, avoid cutting off the entire community of Tucker Hill from the city, and displace only a minimal number of residences, a horse farm, and some planned communities. Plan B is the most cost-effective plan and better meets the need for bypassing highway 380, improving east-west traffic flow, and enhancing safety. Plan B would also have less of an impact on the community and environment compared to Plan A. Plan A reduces the efficacy of every major goal stated by the DOT. As taxpayers and residents, we must consider the long-term benefits and costs of each plan. Plan B is the best option as it is more cost-effective and better meets the need for bypassing highway 380, improving east-west traffic flow, and enhancing safety. We must consider the impact that the project will have on the community and the environment for decades to come. Therefore, I urge the Texas Department of Transportation, McKinney, and Prosper to build Plan B. Sincerely, Reddy Tummala</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix. Our comparison of Segments A and B showed that there was not a substantial difference in traffic metrics such as travel times, travel speeds, and Level of Service.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>No proposed alternatives are within the boundaries of the City of Plano since it is outside of this project's study area.</p>
1754	4/20/2023	Reed F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I oppose segment A. I support segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1755	2/25/2023	Renate Hodkowski	Email	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Segment B is much less disruptive and makes more sense for what the new bypass is trying to accomplish. Thank you, Renate Hodkowski</p>	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1756	3/7/2023	Renee Brandish	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Renee Brandish	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1757	4/20/2023	Renee D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to option A. It's mind boggling that a cheaper option is available without major disruption to neighborhoods and families. People have invested their entire livelihoods to live in in this area. We not only pay taxes but we contribute daily to the businesses, restaurants etc that help support Mckinney's economy. We should have a say in this. I'm a registered nurse and I believe that MainGate is a wonderful place that helps many people. However....it can be relocated to an even better, bigger facility to help people. Option B is the better, cheaper option that would disrupt fewer homes, families and businesses. If MainGate was not located on that tract of land would option B already have happened?. Please rethink option A plan and go with option B for the sake of the citizens that give back daily to this wonderful community.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1758	2/17/2023	Renee Francis	Online	OPPOSED TO SEGMENT C: I live in the Willow Wood community and moved there specifically to get away from all the crazy highway and city chaos. Segments C will run along the southern edge of our community, resulting in more traffic noise and pollution in our area. Segment C will also destroy many homes & business's of our neighbors in the southeast. Segment D would be less destructive with a route that would follow the largely unpopulated flood plain that flows directly south to the existing US 380.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.
1759	4/20/2023	Renee G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment	Your comment is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1760	3/16/2023	Renee Nelson	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1761	4/20/2023	Residents of Stonebridge Ranch (2,025 signatures)	Email	<p>In the US 380 Bypass project (Coit Road to FM 1827), TxDOT has proposed the construction of Segment A which will cause untold damages to our Stonebridge Ranch lifestyle. Join the SRCA Board of Directors in opposing construction of Segment A in the proposed US 380 Bypass project.</p> <p>NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1762	3/16/2023	Rey Lopez	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1763	4/20/2023	Rhea L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>380 is already a nightmare as it is! Let's not make it worst. No to Segment A! Yes to B!</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1764	3/6/2023	Rhoda Lynn	Email (2)	<p>I have been a resident of Collin County all my life and currently live in McKinney so I will be directly impacted by the Highway 380 Bypass. I am writing to ask you to support Route D. Route C is a terrible path because it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>severely damage one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>destroy 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D</li> <li>disturb the wetlands that serve as a refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>eliminate a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species</li> <li>divide residential and farming/ranching communities</li> <li>affect and displace significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources</li> <li>has worse traffic performance (lower traffic capacity, slower travel speeds, and more elevation changes)</li> </ul> <p>Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife which prefers Route D. Please put your support behind Route D. It's important to the people who live and work in McKinney. Too often government only looks at what's presented in front of them and forgets to fully consider the consequences to the daily life of the people who have to live with the choices made by the government. Thank you,</p> <p>Rhoda Lynn                      1728 Bonner Street                      McKinney, TX 75069                      214-808-7526</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1765	4/20/2023	Rhodri R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This is a horrible idea.	Your comment is noted.
1766	4/20/2023	Rich F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1767	4/20/2023	Rich W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Option A, please. Yes to Option B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1768	2/6/2023	Richard / Pamela Weibley	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1769	3/28/2023	Richard and Martha Bustamente	Email	In the US 380 Bypass project (Coit Road to FM 1827), TxDOT has proposed the construction of Segment A which will cause untold damage to our Stonebridge Ranch lifestyle. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Richard & Martha Bustamente	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1770	2/24/2023	Richard Beauregard	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Richard Beauregard 612 Braxton Ct McKinney, Tx 75071 Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1771	3/29/2023	Richard Clare	Email	Mr. Endres, I support Segment A of the 380 Bypass as I have since the first plans were revealed. I also hope you will implement the Alternative Plan for the intersection at 380/Custer. Regards, Richard Clare Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad	Your comment and support of the project and the Alternative Design for the US 380 and Custer Road intersection is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1772	3/26/2023	Richard Crookston	Online	<p>We began building a home in Erwin Farms in August 2022. Some months after beginning the building we came found out about the 380 bypass. There was no signage showing a proposed 8 lane freeway + 4 lanes of access that we be next to our neighborhood. Now we are less than 2000 feet from the freeway. We would never have bought there had we known there was going to be a major freeway there. We don't understand why it is not being built north of Erwin Park where there is less development at this time. Why is not the Collin County Outer Loop used which is labeled as a designated loop as traffic by pass. It was started over 10 years ago which probably already has right of ways. We think the proposal of putting a by-pass in the middle of existing and in progress neighborhoods (i.e. Painted Tree, Erwin Farms, Timber Creek) is not in good faith and undermines the trust of the community that the TXDOT, City of McKinney and the developers have for the welfare of their constituents.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. While the project would run adjacent to the Erwin Farms neighborhood, it would not go through it. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Multiple notices have been sent to property owners and current residences since the first US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study Public Meeting in Spring 2018.</p> <p>There are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>
1773	3/30/2023	Richard E Bustamente	Email	<p>I appreciate your consideration.</p> <p>As a side note, I travel HWY 380 almost daily, my concern is that we really need to consider where the traffic on 380 really begins to become heavy to the point of congestion. I believe it really starts at the intersection of 380 and 720 the traffic increases and really clogs up at the intersection of 380 and 423 and continues all the way to HWY 5 and 380. It seems to me the farther back toward Denton, we set the alternate route to HWY 5 the more we can reduce the traffic flow to and Thru Mckinney. Another comment, the traffic flow from Coit rd to Hwy 5 could see an immediate improvement if the traffic light were timed properly to provide a continuous flow of green lights, currently, you cannot drive from Coit rd on a green light thru Lake Forest. the lights at lake Forest continually cause traffic stoppage. I recognize your trying your best to satisfy all concerned, Love to have a discussion if you would like.</p> <p>Richard E Bustamente 928-925-4079</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT evaluated possible changes in signal timing during the Feasibility Study and determined it was not a long- term solution for future traffic. TxDOT and the local municipalities share responsibility for signal timing in the corridor.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1774	3/27/2023	Richard Evans	Email	<p>Dear TxDOT:</p> <p>I am writing to protest the recommended alignment of Segment A for the 380 proposal as it currently stands.</p> <p>I am a resident of Stonebridge Ranch which has over 9,000 families with over 36,000 people living in this community. Segment A alignment will drastically effect these residents as our main road running through our community will be adversely affected by this proposed alignment. It makes far more sense to connect the bypass further to the west beyond Custer Road as per Segment B. TxDOT is proposing a bypass so lets make it as good a bypass as it can be. Dumping the traffic onto 380 as proposed in Segment A makes no sense. It leaves more of 380 congested than Proposal B. As I understand it proposal A will cost over 100 million dollars more to construct which is a waste of my tax dollars. An ariel view of land for both proposals shows that B makes more sense and will not run right next to an existing community of Tucker Hill. Proposal B runs through vacant land that has not been developed. A horse farm can be easily moved and Prosper's plans for development can be changed but the Tucker Community is already there and many families will be affected. Anyone looking at the design plans can see that Segment B is the best selection. It will bypass traffic further west, effect current residents of Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill the least and cost millions less to build. I there strongly stand against the Segment A proposed alignment.</p> <p>Richard Evans</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p>
1775	3/10/2023	Richard Hanson	Online	<p>Hello - Can you please reconsider option B? We have lived in Tucker Hill for 7 years and are very concerned about sound and pollution levels from the East Side of option A. Our taxes continue to increase, we are middle class, and we're concerned about higher taxes to fund the lord expensive option A versus option B.</p> <p>Further, if it is not possible to have option B, can you shift the East section heading north further East from Tucker Hill? And can you add sound walls.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p> <p>Shifting Segment A to the east would potentially displace more existing residents than the proposed Segment A. It is also likely that there would be issues with impacts to community resources such as the Zinger Bat and Aviator ball parks.</p>
1776	3/16/2023	Richard Henderson	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1777	2/6/2023	Richard K. Randall	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1778	3/10/2023	Richard Nichols	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Richard Nichols 7704 Michael Ct [REDACTED] Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1779	2/22/2023	Richard Randall	Online	The road FM 1827 in inset G. This needs to be looked at again because Traffic coming from the North to the South, forces travelers to go out of there way to go East on HWY380. I would suggest to leave the road there and do a short extension where the light is and do a turn to the left with a small off ramp to go East on HWY380.	Your comment is noted. The design for Inset G was created as a response to the DEIS design (shown in the main plan view) where we received numerous concerns that connecting University and FM 1827 would funnel a high volume of traffic along FM 1827. Please note that the County's future thoroughfare plan includes additional east-west thoroughfares that connect Segment C to New Hope that offer improved connections without funneling traffic from University on to FM 1827.
1780	3/8/2023	Richard Thomas Dover	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. Segment B has the west end of the bypass the furthest west. This is needed to carry traffic now and for the future growth in the area. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Please consider this option over Segment A. Segment A will destroy more businesses, cost many millions more to build, and cause greater disruption. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Richard Thomas Dover	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.  The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
1781	4/20/2023	Rick D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I'm concerned this route will negatively affect my Stonebridge home value	Your comment is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.
1782	2/16/2023	Rick Eubank	Paper form	Section C goes through too many homes, businesses, wetland, and forests. D was/is a much better route.	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1783	4/20/2023	Rick Franklin	Online	<p>As both a Tucker Hill resident and a member of the McKinney City council, I, as I have always been, am against the choice of Route A and in favor of Route B regarding the Hwy 380 bypass. It concerns me that this project is going to cost taxpayers an additional 100+ million dollars over the estimate for Route B. There will be numerous and detrimental effects to our community due to the close proximity to this proposed highway. If this is the final choice of TxDOT, which I hope is not, then I would encourage TxDOT to work with both the city and the residents to come together on various mitigation options to improve the quality of life for the residents of Tucker Hill during and after the construction of the Hwy 380 bypass. Rick Franklin</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Texas Administrative Code, Title 43, Section 15.52 requires local governments be responsible for a specified percentage of actual project costs. The minimum percentage of local participation is designated by the department on a case-by-case basis but is typically 10% of actual project costs. The dollar amount you mention is an estimate and still needs to be finalized since the project costs provided at the Public Hearing are high-level estimates, using the information available now. As final design continues, these will be updated.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible.</p>
1784	4/20/2023	Rick G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A. YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1785	2/22/2023	Rick Stuckmann	Online	<p>US 380 EIS Project Coit Road to FM 1827 TxDOT has selected the Blue Alternative as the preferred alternative over the other alternatives being considered. The Blue Alternative is more environmentally impactful than the Brown Alternative with the Blue Alternative permanently impacting more acreage of wetlands and more linear feet of rivers/streams. The Blue Alternative also impacts more acreage of forest habitat. Given this phase is the Draft Environmental Impact Study, it is surprising more weight was not given to these environmental factors. The Blue Alternative has also consistently been one of the more costly options as TxDOT has gone through the various phases of evaluating the project alternatives. Based on the Draft Environmental Impact Study, the Blue Alternative costs approximately \$200 million more than the Brown alternative. TxDOT has a fiduciary duty to be fiscally responsible when evaluating project alternatives. The information provided at the public meetings included additional justifications on why the Blue Alternative, which includes Segment A, was chosen over the Brown Alternative, including Segment B. It states 3 fewer residences will be displaced with Segment A vs Segment B. However, the information fails to mention Segment A displaces 14 more businesses than Segment B. The number of businesses displaced by Segment A is likely to grow as the land north of US 380 and east of Custer is currently under development which will only increase the cost of the Blue Alternative when ROW is acquired.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition to the Blue Alternative is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives and the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33.</p> <p>According to the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS available at the Public Hearing and the Public Hearing website, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>As a part of this project, future developments were closely tracked by TxDOT and discussed with the City of McKinney and Town of Prosper as well as developers. Appendix S of the DEIS details indirect and cumulative effects. Information for Chase at Wilson Creek and Billingsley Developments were included in considerable future development impacts on the Segment Analysis Matrix and development heat map that was</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>The information also states Segment A has fewer impacts on planned residential homes vs Segment B. The only planned residential development called out in the Draft Environmental Impact Study was related to Segment B which goes through a small corner of Prosper. There were no planned residential developments in McKinney specifically called out in the study that would be impacted. This is even though Segment A would go directly through at least 3 planned residential developments (Chase at Wilson Creek Phases 1 and 2 and Billingsley). These planned residential developments are slightly ahead of some of the Prosper planned developments and slightly behind others in planning according to the Rapidly Developing Study Area heat map presented at the public meeting. In fact, Chase at Wilson Creek phase 1 is scheduled to be completed May 2024. These will be apartments and the area is in need of more affordable housing. The deference TXDOT has given to Prosper's planned development over McKinney's planned development in this process is unconscionable.</p> <p>The information also states that Segment A "avoids impact to MainGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, subject of substantial public concern". During meetings held last spring for the US 380 project, TXDOT stated a review was done of other therapeutic horsemanship properties near highways and concluded there was no evidence this negatively impacted their operations. TXDOT stated that MainGait was no longer a major concern in making the preferred alternative recommendation. The public is divided on this topic, and it should not be a deciding factor in TXDOT's preferred alternative decision.</p> <p>Given the Blue Alternative is more environmentally impactful and costs at least \$200 million more than the Brown alternative, and for the other reasons stated above, I respectfully request TXDOT reconsider its recommendation and select the Brown Alternative as the preferred alternative. TXDOT has a fiduciary responsibility to the environment and to taxpayers to do so.</p> <p>Rick Stuckmann 8000 Castine Drive McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>shared at the Public Hearing and Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1786	1/24/2023	Rick Vander Heiden	Online	<p>As a resident of Stonebridge Ranch and utilize park space with family nearby every day, add a comment to express my disapproval of the by pass through Mckinney and would prefer the less populated route through Prosper. The route through Proper will affect an area with less population density as seen you the map provided. I believe this issue has been overcomplicated and the simplicity of the issue is evident.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis.</p> <p>TxDOT selected Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul>
1787	2/6/2023	Rick/Sherri Eubank	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives</li> <li>Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1788	4/20/2023	Ricky H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A. This route has a much higher impact on existing homes and businesses as well as the significantly greater impacts on existing traffic during the construction period. Please reconsider and choose Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1789	2/17/2023	Rita M. Ingram	Email	<p>To whom it may,                      Please know that those of us in McKinney that will be impacted by this future construction do not agree with the government seizure of 29 homes rather than choosing Route D which limits the impact to 7 seized lands. With the Route C plan the government is taking community ranch land that is used for the mental health and therapeutic riding of residents that visit. By going through the flood plains, you can save a lot of private land and keep the residents much happier within the districts. No one agrees with the process of condemnation, as it is legal government theft of the American Dream. If absolutely necessary, at least do something that is the least impactful to the Texas residents that have lived there for years. Thank you for your time.                      Rita M. Ingram                      Have a Fantastic Day!</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled “The Purchase of Right of Way,” and “Relocation Assistance,” are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.</p>
1790	3/15/2023	Ritu Sam	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Ritu Sam 6405 Wind Song Dr McKinney 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1791	3/17/2023	Rob Stogsdill	Online	<p>I am writing to support the selection of Segment A for US HWY 380's direction. For the many reasons stated above on this site, it simply makes the most sense and is the least impactful all around. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.</p>
1792	3/28/2023	Rob Yeichner	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Rob Yeichner 1717 Landon Lane McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1793	3/5/2023	Robb Jackson	Email	<p>Mr. Endress: As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas, I strongly oppose the construction of segment A and support segment B in the blue alternative as proposed for US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks for your consideration in this matter.</p> <p>Robb Jackson Robb Jackson Enclave Builders 900 Bridge Point Cir. McKinney, TX 75072 Phone: (214) 868-8000 Fax: (214) 705-9657</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1794	4/4/2023	Robert A. Pine	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I first want to thank you for your service to the State of Texas. We Texans tend to overlook the dedicated service State of Texas public officials as yourself provide us. Thank you. As a 31-year resident of Collin County, I am writing regarding the proposed bypass of Highway 380 on the northern part of Collin County. My understanding is that the A-E-D alignment was recommended, following the feasibility study. However, at the last meeting regarding this matter, the A-E-C alignment was proposed as the preferred alternative. I would like to express my opposition to this preferred alternative proposal. Earlier in the process, when other segments were studied, emphasis was given on impacting fewer homes, utilizing more of the existing US 380, and also public concern. If these same criteria were applied to the bypass in question, segment D would be the appropriate choice. Segment C disrupts and destroys longtime communities along County Road 338 and FM 2933. We have 30-year friends whose property would be disrupted by the proposed highway, their small business destroyed, and the rural lifestyle they chose over 30 years ago, destroyed. Several of their closeby neighbors would completely have their long-held rural lifestyle destroyed and lose their property. At stake also is the peaceful lifestyle which led them to this rural location many years ago, and the loss of neighbors who are close friends. If the alternative Segment D were chosen, only one community of a few homes along Woodlawn Road would be affected, versus over 18 homes on Segment C. Also, Segment D does not put neighbors on opposite sides of a noisy freeway, as does Segment C. Segment C neighbors would be cutoff from their longtime neighbors. I request that the initial A-E-D alignment on the proposed Highway 380 new alignment, recommended in the Feasibility Study, be implemented.</p> <p>Robert A. Pine</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT's Recommended Alignment, which included a conceptual Segment D section, was based on the data collected during the Feasibility Study. Throughout the subsequent NEPA process, TxDOT has gathered more detailed information, and will continue to work with stakeholders to gather information.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1795	4/20/2023	Robert and Kathy B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Why would we choose to pay millions more to accomplish the same expansion?	The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.
1796	2/25/2023	Robert and Rebecca Gredig	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>With great respect, I ask that you consider my comments below regarding the 380 bypass. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Reasons to consider OPPOSING Segment A:  Costs taxpayers \$98.8 million more  Impacts 57% more natural wetlands &amp; wildlife  Negatively impacts Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods</p> <p>Reasons to SUPPORT Segment B:  Requires 73% fewer business and residential displacements  Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at U.S. 380 &amp; Custer Road  14% shorter, saving time and money</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,  Robert &amp; Rebecca Gredig  6509 Valley View Drive  McKinney, TX</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1797	4/20/2023	Robert B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1798	4/20/2023	Robert C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	US 380 Proposed Route - NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1799	4/20/2023	Robert C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am strongly in favor of segment B over segment A.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1800	3/7/2023	Robert Carey	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, Robert Carey	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1801	3/29/2023	Robert Clough	Online	Your selection of Segment A is a decision not supported by the facts. I am opposed to Segment A and support Segment B. Three of the four reasons given to support the decision to select Segment C are: Impacts fewer utilities Costs is less Minimizes impact to floodplains and flood ways. Applying this same criteria to A vs B would conclude B is preferred. Looks like the criteria was selected to support the conclusion you wanted not an impartial decision based on the facts	Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B is noted. The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1802	4/18/2023	Robert Clough	Online	Attachment April 18, 2023 To whom it may concern: As a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of political maneuvering, campaigning, and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait that ostensibly has swayed TXDOT's position, and I publicly condemn these actions as unethical and improper.  <i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	<i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1803	3/9/2023	Robert Donley	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1804	2/16/2023	Robert Gredig	Email	I am writing to give my support for the "Brown" 380 bypass alignment that includes sections B, C, & E. As a home Physical Therapist, I drive 380 every day, and I am routinely on 380 between Princeton and Little Elm (423). Due to our ever growing population, and the resulting increase in traffic, I think that the wider we can make the bypass the more that traffic will be diverted from 380. I also believe that there is a significant problem area at the intersection of North Stonebridge Drive and 380 where a large number of very serious motor vehicle accidents have occurred. If section A is approved, then this area will end up having an increase in traffic. I implore you to seriously consider the future of our area and how making the bypass as wide as possible from East to West will benefit the congestion on 380 in the future. Thank you for considering my opinion. Robert Allen Gredig 6509 Valley View Drive McKinney, TX 75071 214.843.4622 [REDACTED]	Your comment and support of the Brown Alternative is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.
1805	4/20/2023	Robert H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Oppose Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1806	3/7/2023	Robert Hansen	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely Robert Hansen	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1807	3/16/2023	Robert Hansen	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1808	4/20/2023	Robert J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1809	4/20/2023	Robert P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I oppose Segment A and Support Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1810	2/6/2023	Robert Purser	Segment C Petition	Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3 1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative) 2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons: - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1811	4/20/2023	Robert S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I oppose the proposed Segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1812	3/16/2023	Robert Seal	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1813	3/10/2023	Robert Solomon	Email	NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Robert Solomon 2505 Wales Drive McKinney, TX. 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1814	3/28/2023	Robert Tozier	Email	Good evening, I hope this finds you well! As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Robert Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1815	3/28/2023	Robert Winston Allen	Email	NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Robert Winston Allen 1904 Van Landingham Dr McKinney, TX 75071 Robert Winston Allen, DDS	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1816	3/28/2023	Roberto Farias	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Roberto Farias.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1817	2/25/2023	Robertt Gilani	Email (2)	I would like to provide feedback regarding Segment A: As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas, I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards, Robertt Gilani Sent from my iPad	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1818	4/20/2023	Robin B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Option A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1819	3/25/2023	Robin Lucero	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, As a resident of Whitley Place, I continue to strongly oppose bypass alternative B, if we can not “keep 380 on 380”, for which the city of McKinney should have taken all measures to ensure, as did Prosper. Specific to the environmental impact assessments undertaken: § I believe it’s imperative that the Segment B alternative recognize the ADA and minority community of people with disabilities benefiting from therapeutic/other essential services and designate ManeGait as an essential service provider for the community of people with disabilities, which is comparatively more essential than service suppliers supporting other minority groups. ManeGait is a PATH Premier Accredited Center providing essential services to people with disabilities including: Autism Spectrum Disorder, Cerebral Palsy, Intellectual Disability, Developmental Delay, Down Syndrome, ADD/ADHD, Sensory Processing Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, among many other disabilities defined in the ADA. § Additionally, selection of Segment B alternative would have a devastating impact on the Town of Prosper’s Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan and Hike and the Bike Trail Master Plan. Segment B would render Rutherford Park and the Prosper Independent School District’s planned Nature Center, along with Ladera and Wandering Creek Parks and the trail system within the Rutherford Creek Greenbelt useless or unusable. I appreciate your serious consideration of this position, Robin Lucero Sent from Mail for Windows	Your comment and opposition of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.  The EIS evaluates the potential effects on low-income and minority populations per Executive Order 12898. For the analysis TxDOT uses the definitions provided in the Appendix to USDOT Order 5610.2C dated May 14, 2021, which defines a “minority person” as a person who is: Black, Hispanic or Latino, Asian American, American Indian and Alaskan Native, or Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.  TxDOT, as an agent for the FHWA, is required to comply with ADA when providing access for persons with disabilities to its streets and sidewalks. Neither TxDOT nor Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), have ADA oversight responsibilities for projects outside of the public right-of-way that do not use federal surface transportation program funds. None of the reasonable alternatives would have required TxDOT to acquire property from ManeGait.  It is not necessary for TxDOT to make a determination regarding whether use of Wandering Creek Park and Ladera Park would or would not be in compliance with Section 4(f) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)’s implementing regulations at 23 CFR Part 744 because the preferred Blue Alternative does not use either of those parks. As explained in Section 3.9 of the FEIS, the Blue Alternative would require right-of-way from Rutherford Park; however, that would be the case with respect to any of the reasonable alternatives evaluated in the FEIS. TxDOT will evaluate Rutherford Park under Section 4(f).

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1820	3/16/2023	Robin Nooner	Email	To whom it may concern, I writing to let you know my Aunt's horses and her beautiful home is in the middle of the Route C plan. We love visiting her and her horses. Please reconsider this route. We do not want her horse farm to be taken away from her. Also, my aunt bought this property to retire on. They've spent every dime they gave to live on FM 2933. And I'd hate to see this Highway go through their dreams. Please use another route instead of Route C. Thanks, Robin. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1821	4/20/2023	Robyn B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Avoid destroying our homes and investments with segment A. No to segment A. B is the only sensible choice.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1822	3/14/2023	Robyn Braun	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Robyn Braun 1508 Litchfield Dr McKinney Tx 75071	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1823	4/20/2023	Robyn C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No vote for Segment A. It will directly impact lives in Stonebridge Ranch , the second largest master planned community. Segment B is the desirable plan as it will have the least effect on residents lifestyle. Merging the proposed bypass at Coit Road is the better route as this will allow the convergence to occur in a lesser populated section of 380, and not within the already congested section of 380 which runs through McKinney.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1824	3/29/2023	Rod	Email	please go with option B. It is the truly only option that makes complete sense. To bring additional traffic to hwy 380 at this congested point is ludicrous..please look at this in our way when deciding.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1825	3/7/2023	Rod Calk	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1826	3/12/2023	Rodney Gestes	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks, Rodney Gestes	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1827	3/15/2023	Rodney Lackey	Email	Greetings, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Respectfully, Rodney Lackey	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1828	4/20/2023	Roman S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	US 380 Proposed Route - NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1829	4/5/2023	Ron Alderman	Online	I would like to voice my opposition to the selection of segment A instead of segment B. My understanding is that TxDOT is selecting the more expensive option, placing an undue burden on taxpayers of McKinney and Texas in general, which is interesting in itself. The real issue, though is that this approach will increase traffic and congestion into the more populated areas of McKinney, specifically the intersections of 380 with Custer and Stonebridge. It seems as if TxDOT is giving more consideration to the plans of Prosper versus the real, existing development in McKinney. Segment B impacts areas that are to date lightly developed while segment A impacts existing developed areas. Please reconsider and select segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B is noted. Public input and cost are important factors but not the only factors that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS.  Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A: -Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B -Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes -Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>of Custer Road                      -Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment                      -Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern                      -Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</p>
1830	3/8/2023	Ron and Judy Berteotti	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,                      As homeowners and citizens of McKinney, TX, we strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, we understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. We live in the Wren Creek neighborhood of Stonebridge Ranch which partly borders on US 380. The increased noise and pollution from the proposed Segment A will not only adversely affect our quality of life but will also surely adversely affect the value of our property. We strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely,                      Ron and Judy Berteotti                      1901 La Cima Drive                      McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. Several noise barriers have been proposed between US 380 and the Stonebridge Ranch neighborhood. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					the Preferred Alternative by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway.
1831	2/21/2023	Ron Blumka	Voicemail	Good afternoon my name is Ron Blumka. I reside at 3316 Lewis in Plano. 75023 is my zip. phone number is 469-450-2303. I'm calling to express my opinion regarding the proposed action to be taken by Texas DOT. I am interested only in seeing the highway 380 project pursue options D. Anything else would be disruptive. it would violate the ecology. it would emperil the environment. Thank you very much.	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted.
1832	3/16/2023	Ron Denne	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1833	3/6/2023	Ron Justice	Comment Form	The preferred alternative links segment A, E & C is a great choice.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1834	2/16/2023	Ronald DeJong	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>As a 20 year resident of Stonebridge Ranch in McKinney, TX I have seen the population of the city expand more than 3X during this time. This massive highway project should have been reasonably anticipated and completed at least 5 years ago considering easement and cost overrun implications to the taxpayers of Collin County and the State of Texas. The project Segment "A" for all practical purposes has been finalized with the near completion of the bridge construction as it adjoins Hwy 380 and Ridge Road as observed while driving on this roadway. Therefore the notice in the mail from the State of Texas appears to be a moot point. The preference for the tortuous route "A" proposed will come with significant traffic and easement implications for Stonebridge Ranch homeowners at Hwy 380 despite the persuasive literature provided. Segment "B" would have made more sense with consideration for traffic flow optimization adjoining west of Custer Rd &amp; Hwy 380. This process has been a huge disappointment and I do NOT support Segment "A" for the proposed highway improvement US380 Coit Road to FM 1827. Cordially,</p> <p>Ronald DeJong 1504 Canyon Wren Drive McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The current improvements to Ridge Road are being constructed by the City of McKinney and is not a controlled access freeway.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. Additionally, the project will not require acquisition of right-of-way from Stonebridge Ranch.</p>
1835	4/20/2023	Ronald F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please do the correct thing	Your comment is noted.
1836	3/30/2023	Ronald Lucero	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>As a resident of Whitley Place, I continue to strongly oppose bypass alternative B, if we can not "keep 380 on 380", for which the city of McKinney should have taken all measures to ensure, as did Prosper. Specific to the environmental impact assessments undertaken:</p> <p>§ I believe it's imperative that the Segment B alternative recognize the ADA and minority community of people with disabilities benefiting from therapeutic/other essential services and designate ManeGait as an essential service provider for the community of people with disabilities, which is comparatively more essential than service suppliers supporting other minority groups. ManeGait is a PATH Premier Accredited Center providing essential services to people with disabilities including: Autism Spectrum Disorder, Cerebral Palsy, Intellectual Disability, Developmental Delay, Down Syndrome, ADD/ADHD, Sensory Processing Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, among many other disabilities defined in the ADA.</p> <p>§ Additionally, selection of Segment B alternative would have a devastating impact on the Town of Prosper's Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan and Hike and the Bike Trail Master Plan. Segment B would render Rutherford Park and the Prosper Independent School District's planned Nature Center, along with Ladera and Wandering Creek Parks and the trail system within the Rutherford Creek Greenbelt useless or unusable.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the potential effects on low-income and minority populations per Executive Order 12898. For the analysis TxDOT uses the definitions provided in the Appendix to USDOT Order 5610.2C dated May 14, 2021, which defines a "minority person" as a person who is: Black, Hispanic or Latino, Asian American, American Indian and Alaskan Native, or Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.</p> <p>TxDOT, as an agent for the FHWA, is required to comply with ADA when providing access for persons with disabilities to its streets and sidewalks. Neither TxDOT nor Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), have ADA oversight responsibilities for projects outside of the public right-of-way that do not use federal surface transportation program funds. None of the reasonable alternatives would have required TxDOT to acquire property from ManeGait.</p> <p>It is not necessary for TxDOT to make a determination regarding whether use of Wandering Creek Park and Ladera Park would or would not be in</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				I appreciate your serious consideration of this position, Ronald Lucero Sent from Mail for Windows	compliance with Section 4(f) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)'s implementing regulations at 23 CFR Part 744 because the preferred Blue Alternative does not use either of those parks. As explained in Section 3.9 of the FEIS, the Blue Alternative would require right-of-way from Rutherford Park; however, that would be the case with respect to any of the reasonable alternatives evaluated in the FEIS. TxDOT will evaluate Rutherford Park under Section 4(f).
1837	4/20/2023	Ronald R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Why not push this 1 mile north and begin it west of Prosper? Lots of empty land to the north... these plans make no sense.	It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
1838	3/16/2023	Ronald W. Wallace	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1839	3/28/2023	Ronnie Holcomb	Email	We currently live in Stonebridge ranch and are 3 house in from 380. Our house backs up to a green space witch is not blocked by a sound barrier. Will a sound barrier be built to block road noise in this area? Thanks Ronnie Holcomb Sent from my iPhone	Your comment and concerns about traffic noise is noted. Your comment and concern about traffic noise is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.  TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Stonebridge Ranch. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.
1840	3/28/2023	Roseann Patterson	Email	NO Segment A to 380 bypass	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1841	2/6/2023	Rowdy Starnes	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1842	4/20/2023	Roy C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote no for Segment A! YES to Segment B!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1843	4/20/2023	Royce D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	yes to segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1844	3/14/2023	Russ Buettner	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Russ Buettner 1107 Waterfall Drive, McKinney, TX 713-408-2554	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1845	4/1/2023	Russell Lewis	Email (2)	Hello Stephen and Ceason, I am writing to request an additional extension of time to submit comments for the EIS as our lives, our homes, our health, and our safety will be potentially impacted daily by the actions of TxDOT. Our neighborhood leaders were waiting for a meeting with TxDOT engineers and experts to clarify some of our outstanding questions to help with our comments and after a month of waiting were told by TxDOT the meeting would no longer be an option. This has left us trying to sort out our study-related questions and hundreds of pages of analysis on our own over the past ten days. We have an outstanding list of questions regarding the noise and air pollution studies, mitigation, community impacts, traffic data, and the overall process. The city of McKinney has agreed to meet with our neighborhood leaders to help with our mitigation concerns, but that critical meeting, in order for us to submit proper comments, is pending a date that will likely not occur until after April 5. Our comments over the past 7 years have largely been shaped by what we learn from the TxDOT engineers and experts. According to the NEPA process, we know that once the comments have been collected, those comments are what help to shape the next steps of the FEIS and ROD. While a meeting with TxDOT would still be our preference, if we are left to continue to sort this out independently, we need more time. We were only given notice that our questions would not be answered on March 20, 2023. As the regulation allows for a longer comment period if deemed necessary to ensure the public and other stakeholders have sufficient time to review and provide meaningful input on complex or contentious projects, I hope we as homeowners and taxpayers can be afforded this patience and grace as we aim to learn more, respond thoughtfully, and protect our families and communities. Thank you, Russell Lewis 7116 Ripley Street	This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.  Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				McKinney, TX 75071 (214) 563-7002 mb	
1846	3/16/2023	RW Arnold	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1847	3/28/2023	Ryan and Sharon Rickaby	Email	Good afternoon, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Ryan & Sharon Rickaby and our 3 teenage daughters.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1848	4/20/2023	Ryan D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	B is \$100-\$200 M cheaper , displaces 0 businesses and utilizes less of the existing 380 which is the entire purpose of a bypass	Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.  The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1849	3/7/2023	Ryan Duffy	Email	<p>Hello Stephen,                      I'm writing you as a resident of Tucker Hill at 7313 Stanhope Street. First, my comments previously sent through the keep it moving platform are not being included in the public records requests nor appendixes on the TXDOT website. I was very harsh in regards to our city council, TXDOT, a congressman, and Bill Darling in those comments so while I want to consider their exclusion a coincidence I am not so confident it was a mistake. I have all IP addresses that would be associated with my wife's and my comments previously sent. I decided to email you directly in hopes my comments make the public forums going forward. Per public campaign finance records, I believe there to be potential corruption between McKinney city council, TXDOT, our district's US Congressman, McKinney's Mayor Fuller &amp; Prosper Developer Bill Darling. My research has been sent to countless local media outlets and they are assessing how and if to pursue further. Although Route A was \$200 million more expensive and more invasive on the environment as well as displacing more businesses it was chosen instead of Route B as the preferred route. I believe this to be entirely because of the money and power Bill Darling wields and TXDOT is hiding behind the amount of survey comments received as justification. Bill Darling and Prosper used a ludicrous narrative to how route B would impact the Main Gate Horse Therapy charity if it was selected. The Dallas morning news front page propaganda article never told both sides of the route A vs B impact. That facility could have been moved and land was offered to accommodate this move. This facility not coincidentally resides right on Bill Darling's large personal estate. Somehow a man worth over \$20 million dollars was painted as the victim even though his personal estate in Prosper is bigger than the entire community land of Tucker Hill combined. Most of this is known, but part of my legal pursuit going forward will be in regards to Bill Darling's financial ties with McKinney Mayor Fuller and a majority of the city council members in McKinney as well as TXDOT and our state representatives which I believe led directly to how little those same individuals fought to keep Route A from being picked and will most certainly influence them when it comes time to how they vote on burdening the city of McKinney tax payers with the projected \$120 million (city's share) to execute this by TXDOT. They also want the 380 expansion at any cost in order to not hinder access to their new commercial airport project. Bill Darling lead a political PAC called The McKinney Team, after looking into campaign finance reports it is public record to say this PAC has contributed \$11k to the campaigns of McKinney Mayor George Fuller over the last 5 years, \$2k to Council Member Gere Feltus in 2021, \$10,859 to Council Member Charlie Philips since 2017, \$4,780 to Council Member Patrick Cloutier and \$4,600 to Council Member Justin Beller. That not coincidentally is a majority (5) of the 7 current McKinney council members. These campaign facts should have disqualified them from representing the city of McKinney in efforts to prevent Route A from being chosen. Whether Bill Darling's influence over them or not is real the possibility of improprieties especially the looming vote to impact the city and tax payers in excess of \$120 M leaves constituents to have their doubts. I and other</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Your previous comments can be found on page 3144 of the Public Meeting documentation posted at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPROVED%200135-02-065etc%20US380_PublicMeetingDocumentation_1%20of%204_08.16.2022.pdf">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPROVED%200135-02-065etc%20US380_PublicMeetingDocumentation_1%20of%204_08.16.2022.pdf</a></p> <p>Public and stakeholder input is an important factor but it is not the only factor that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS.</p> <p>A Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT, at its sole discretion, will make the final selection of an alignment for the project in the Record of Decision.</p> <p>Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>TxDOT has complied with guidance in TxDOT Environmental Compliance Public Involvement Toolkit to provide the public with comment response matrices. I encourage you to view the comment response matrix posted at <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPROVED%200135-02-065etc%20US380_PublicMeetingDocumentation_1%20of%204_08.16.2022.pdf">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPROVED%200135-02-065etc%20US380_PublicMeetingDocumentation_1%20of%204_08.16.2022.pdf</a> that includes a comment you provided on 4/5/2022.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>residents are going to formally ask them on record at a council session in the coming weeks to remove themselves from that future vote if they have received campaign financing from Bill Darling's PAC or return the funds he contributed to them before voting as a sign of good faith. Other than verbally saying they prefer Route B they weren't even willing to pass a resolution on record supporting route B at the request of residents a few weeks back at the city council session. They have done virtually nothing and it's because ultimately they want this Bypass to be completed in total at all costs to enhance the infrastructure of 380 East to West that leads directly to the potential "commercial" airport which is on the ballot in May in McKinney. Bill Darling is everything that is wrong with our society today at a political and wealth hoarding perspective and I believe him to have 5 council members, TXDOT state representatives in his back pocket. One rich man's estate took precedent over 400 homes and 1,600 people in Tucker Hill (could be 800 homes by the time TXDOT begins) even though the further East most Bypass Route was chosen on one side of the 380 expansion yet not on the west side of the 380 expansion. You are now telling Tucker Hill residents you are going to move the bypass even closer to our existing tax paying residence in order to mitigate how much you have to pay to settle with Mr. Billingsley and his apartment complex that doesn't even exist today. McKinney City council isn't willing to litigate route A in fears of losing the overall 380 expansion, I don't share those same views and will spend as much of my time/money/resources to rally and execute litigation against all parties I have listed above. Good day to you. Ryan Duffy</p>	
1850	4/20/2023	Ryan K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I have a son with autism and the noise and air pollution will negatively impact him and other Tucker Hill Residents.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.
1851	3/15/2023	Ryan Thompson	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousand of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Ryan Thompson Ryan Thompson	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1852	4/20/2023	Ryan V	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to B!!! No to A!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1853	3/23/2023	S C	Online	To Mr. Stephen Endres and those it concerns, I am a McKinney business owner, a Prosper homeowner and a daily commuter on 380 and I SUPPORT SEGMENT A ONLY for the 380 bypass option. My family and I are in a unique position because we can see this from both McKinney and Prosper viewpoints and opinions. However, when reviewing the detailed information TXDOT has provided all citizens of both cities and after reviewing the DEIS, Segment A is 100% clearly the best and only option for everyone's futures. Let's use our collective common sense and stand with the DEIS study that clearly shows Segment A as the most viable option and put this issue to rest. I ask you to NOT punish the many because of a few! Citizens in every town and subdivision along the 380 corridors are upset and being pitted against one another because of this expansion project. Please Do The Right Thing! Finalize Segment A as the final decision, close discussions and let's all move forward. Respectfully, Steven Clay	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1854	4/20/2023	S D H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1855	3/7/2023	S Davenport	Online	I live in Tucker Hill but my concerns about selection of option A are separate from the loss in property value and appeal to our neighborhood. If someone could provide a valid explanation of why A was selected over the alternative, I would happily support the decision. None of the information provided in any of the meetings or online forum explain why a more costly, more impactful to private and commercial properties, and neutral environmental option was selected. More importantly, it's hard to imagine that the proposal will significantly improve the long term congestion by dropping off so far to the east. Any improvement that does not leave the door open for expansion toward the tollway and ultimately 35 is short sighted; improvement to the north through prosper celina areas, where the growth is and will be, as a plan for the future seems more prudent use of tax dollars. Bottom line, provide a valid explanation of the choice. More comments against option B is not a valid reason	<p>Your comment is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible.</p> <p>Our traffic It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p>
1856	4/20/2023	S S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A. YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1857	1/26/2023	S.A.	Online	NO BYPASS!! Look further north to build a bypass. Do not build into 380.	Your comment and opposition to the project is noted. There would be similar impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway anywhere north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
1858	2/17/2023	S.A.	Online	NO TO C Effects too many people and businesses	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1859	2/25/2023	Sadia Rahman	Online	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1860	3/20/2023	Sal Berardesco	Comment Form	I live in La Cima (Stonebridge & 380) in Stonebridge HOA. It is unreasonable to construct a freeway with a complete view now available with De La Vega Development. This will devalue all properties in Stonebridge HOA. Currently we have Custer/380 road noise in La cima heard thru our windows and in our backyard while blocks away. This noise level will only intensify while the view will be atrocious! This is not why we moved to McKinney and La Cima. Who in McKinney is protecting our home values like the Prosper mayor has for the past 6+ yrs?	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.
1861	4/20/2023	Sal C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to optional A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1862	4/20/2023	Sally H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1863	4/20/2023	Sally H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1864	3/7/2023	Sally Kesling	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1865	4/20/2023	Sally Y	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Segment B makes more sense. My vote is for segment B makes more sense.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1866	2/6/2023	Salvador/ Julia Sifuentes	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1867	2/22/2023	Sam Echeverry	Online	<p>We 100% recommend plan D. We 100% oppose plan C. Proposal C is very disruptive to folks and their homes/welfare as well as eco systems and good lands, we have been supporting and traveling to this area for many years so we highly recommend plan D!</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1868	4/20/2023	Sam S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Really not understanding why would do an option that cost way more when the option is available and will cause less damage to existing structures.	<p>Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p> <p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p>
1869	4/20/2023	Samantha S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to option A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1870	3/14/2023	Samuel C De Leon Caballe	Online	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>With high respect, I ask that you consider my comments below, regarding the 380 bypass. As a homeowner and citizen of the City of McKinney, Texas, I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A (in Blue and Purple alternatives) and strongly support the construction of Segment B (in the Brown and Golden Alternatives), as proposed by TxDOT for the US380 bypass from Coit Road to FM1827. The main reasons for opposing segment A are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About \$100 million more cost for taxpayers, at least</li> <li>• 57% more impact to natural wetlands and wildlife</li> <li>• Negatively impacts Tucker Hill, Ridgecrest and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods</li> </ul> <p>The main reasons for supporting segment B are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires 73% fewer displacements of business and residential properties</li> <li>• Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at US380 and Custer Road</li> <li>• It is 14% shorter, saving time and money</li> </ul> <p>Thanks for your time and your consideration, Regards Samuel De Leon Caballero 6421 Falcon Ridge Ln, McKinney, Tx, 75071</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1871	3/14/2023	Samuel De Leon Caballero	Email (2)	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>With high respect, I ask that you consider my comments below, regarding the 380 bypass. As a homeowner and citizen of the City of McKinney, Texas, I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A (in Blue and Purple alternatives) and strongly support the construction of Segment B (in the Brown and Golden Alternatives), as proposed by TxDOT for the US380 bypass from Coit Road to FM1827.</p> <p>The main reasons for opposing segment A are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About \$100 million more cost for taxpayers, at least</li> <li>• 57% more impact to natural wetlands and wildlife</li> <li>• Negatively impacts Tucker Hill, Ridgecrest and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods</li> </ul> <p>The main reasons for supporting segment B are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires 73% fewer displacements of business and residential properties</li> <li>• Avoids costly reconstruction of the intersection at US380 and Custer Road</li> <li>• It is 14% shorter, saving time and money</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, as a user of the 380, between Little Elm and 75, I believe that the best option to avoid traffic problems east to Coit, specially between Custer Road and 75, is to start the deviation in the west, as is indicated using option B. I implore you to seriously consider the future of our area and how making the bypass starting west as possible will benefit the congestion of 380 in the future. Thanks for your time and your consideration, Regards.</p> <p>Samuel De Leon Caballero 6421 Falcon Ridge Ln, McKinney, Texas, 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p>
1872	2/24/2023	Sandra C. Peak	Email	<p>Comment: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Sandra C. Peak MD</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1873	3/4/2023	Sandra Cooper	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing concerning the Route C bypass being implemented by the TXDOT. I have looked at both options C and D and would like you to reconsider choosing Route C. Route D appears to be a better option and not affecting as many landowners, woodlands and other natural elements in the area. Even though I am not an engineer, I am an outdoor enthusiast and enjoy the forest and woodlands of your beautiful state. On the route you have chosen, I have enjoyed many peaceful, restful moments and beautiful sunrises and sunsets. I am writing to you in support of the option of Route D. Best regards,</p> <p>Sandra Cooper 397 Bears Road</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				Deridder, La. 70634 Susie	
1874	3/13/2023	Sandra Cooper	Email	<p>I OPPOSE SEGMENT C (Catastrophe)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>o Destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>o Disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>o Eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/ threatened species.</li> <li>o Affects and displaces 383% more homes (29 vs. 6, 300% more businesses (16 vs. 4), and more community resources.</li> <li>o Strongly opposed by Texas Parks and</li> </ul> <p>I OPPOSE SEGMENT C !!! Sandra Cooper</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
1875	2/23/2023	Sandra F	Online	Please keep 380 on 380 in prosper!	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
1876	4/20/2023	Sandra H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote Segment B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1877	2/19/2023	Sandra Ritten	Online	Please keep 380 as 380 We don't want to see any homeowner or farmers displaced	Your comment is noted. The Green Alternative, or Segment F, from Coit Road to FM 1827 (also referred to as "keeping 380 on 380" or expanding the existing US 380 to a freeway), was identified during the Feasibility Study, but ultimately was not carried forward for further analysis after because it would have displaced more than 30 residents and 200 businesses including Raytheon.
1878	4/20/2023	Sandra Z	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1879	4/20/2023	Sandy C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1880	3/16/2023	Sandy huffine	Email	<p>Good Morning Senator Paxton, Representative Leach and Mr Endres- I am sending this on behalf of a dear friend of mine who has a home near Route C. Please see below on the issue of 380 Bypass and consider the options that will affect the least amount of people and our great state of Tx and its resources!</p> <p>Here is why:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>2. Destroy 71% more acres of forests and woodlands</li> <li>3. Destroys 141% more acres of grassland and prairie</li> <li>4. Disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>5. Eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.</li> <li>6. Affects and displaces 383% more of homes ( 29 versus 6)</li> <li>7. Affects and displaces 300% more businesses ( 6 versus 4)</li> <li>8. Affects and displaces more community resources</li> <li>9. Strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife</li> </ol> <p>Please OPPOSE 380 BYPASS ROUTE C! Clearly, ROUTE C SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED. Thank you for your time and consideration, All my best, Sandy Huffine</p>	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1881	1/27/2026	Sara A.	Online	The bypass into 380 is not a desired option.m for both McKinney or Propser residents. We have voiced our opinion on so many options. Please look north into Celina for the bypass. They have the open land to build without worry. Stop trying to force this bypass on Prosper!!!	Your comment and opposition to the project is noted. There would be similar impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway anywhere north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
1882	2/17/2023	Sara Alston	Online	It's too late to build the bypass along the current proposed route. If this was the plan it should have been built years ago. Time to not be so short sighted and look north where things aren't built up. This proposed plan doesn't just impact the land and businesses you are cutting through but there will be such an impact from all of those who will suffer the noise disturbance on a daily basis. NOT Disturbing current residents should be top priority. Prosper and McKinney have made it crystal clear they do NOT want the bypass. Stop proposing it!	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.  Results of public and stakeholder input are available on the Segment Analysis Matrix found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .
1883	3/27/2023	Sara Austin	Online	Please stop the expansion of 380!!! 6 lanes is more than enough and increasing the capacity only hurts the citizens of Prosper. Continuing to push for the expansion is clearly a political mission and has nothing to do with residents and their well being.	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.
1884	4/3/2023	Sara Owen	Written Comment Form	On March 30th, 2023 I saw the TXDOT plan for the 380 bypass Project in McKinney. It was explained that many businesses and possibly homes would be displaced. I know that stonebridge presented an alternative that was not accepted. I would like to see further discussion regarding this project. I AM NOT in favor of the current proposed. Sara Owen 972-754-1089	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1885	3/24/2023	Sarah C Masek	Email	<p>Senator Paxton, Representative Leach, and Mr. Endres: I strongly oppose Segment C and support Segment D due to the lower environmental impact and less homes, businesses, and community services affected. Sarah C Masek Teacher Mckinney ISD Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p>
1886	4/20/2023	Sarah R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Choosing segment A ignores many of the damages and fiscal impacts that the environmental impact survey explained. Segment A is the wrong choice for the community of McKinney. Segment B is an excellent choice with far less detrimental repercussions. Please reconsider and do the right thing for our city!</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives. For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
1887	4/20/2023	Sarah Reyna	Online	<p>Choosing segment A ignores many of the damages and fiscal impacts that the environmental impact survey explained. Segment A is the wrong choice for the community of McKinney. Segment B is an excellent choice with far less detrimental repercussions. Please reconsider and do the right thing for our city!</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>
1888	3/9/2023	Sarah Ross	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1889	2/20/2023	Sarah Schuler	Email	<p>Dear Stephen,                      I recently attended the February 16 meeting. I was disappointed after reading some of the comments listed in the Segment A Details, therefore making Segment A the Preferred Alternative vs Segment B. Very little concrete information was shared. I was surprised that planned future residential homes and proposed residences under construction would have such an impact. I was also surprised that the substantial public concern for ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship was highlighted over the property owner's concern and what the actual impact/harm to their horses would be. Was their input and knowledge considered? Will the 380 bypass actually relieve current traffic congestion by the time construction is started and completed, or will it be obsolete? I also wonder how the expansion of a new Mckinney airport will be impacted. I assume the bypass does not interfere with the proposed airport expansion. I live in La Cima Haven at 380 and Stonebridge. I would hope that an 8 lane freeway with 2 access roads would go further north of growing McKinney. I'm also not sure why there is a need for bike/pedestrian lanes along a major freeway. It seems like a safety hazard.                      Sarah Schuler                      8116 Castine Dr,                      McKinney, TX</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides rigorous analysis of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. There are three categories of analysis that TxDOT can complete as part of NEPA, of which an EIS is the most rigorous. A comment response matrix for comments provided for the March 2022 Public Meeting can be found in the Public Meeting Summary posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-environmental-impact-statement-from-coit-road-to-fm-1827">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-environmental-impact-statement-from-coit-road-to-fm-1827</a>. Public input is an important factor but it is not the only factor that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS.                      Regarding future developments, there are both residential and commercial developments under construction and being planned along Segments A and B. Those that TxDOT was made aware of prior to the Public Hearing are shown on the Segment Analysis Matrix with their development status and the development heat map exhibit available on the Public Hearing website. Many future homes that are currently under construction in the Ladera residential development would have been directly impacted by Segment B. Due to the rapidly changing nature of developments as they go through local planning processes, TxDOT only classified a development as future displacements if the development is expected to be occupied by the anticipated ROD date.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p> <p>Any future improvements will be designed to meet current design standards and address deficiencies of the current roadway system where feasible. The Blue Alternative would likely attract traffic away from the existing US 380, thereby alleviating congestion, and reducing the number of crashes. All segments would be a freeway generally consisting of eight lanes (four in each direction), and two lanes of continuous access roads running parallel to each side. Ten-foot-wide shared use paths (SUP) are proposed for bicyclists and pedestrians adjacent to the frontage roads and</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>would be separated from the frontage roads by a grassed berm or by a concrete barrier depending on location. The Blue Alternative complies with TxDOT's Bicycle Accommodation Design Guidance (adopted April 2, 2021) which also implements USDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policies regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. For more information, see Section 3.5 of the DEIS.</p> <p>This project and the Spur 399 Extension EIS project will not impact the expansion of the McKinney National Airport.</p>
1890	4/20/2023	Sasha R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1891	3/15/2023	Scott and Elizabeth Pertee	Email	<p>Hello</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Scott and Elizabeth Pertee</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1892	2/6/2023	Scott Benson	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D?</p> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1893	4/20/2023	Scott C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Do not go with A! It looks like a 90 degree turn and looks dangerous.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.
1894	4/20/2023	Scott F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Plan B is much less expensive and much less disruptive to existing development, homeowners, and businesses.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1895	3/31/2023	Scott Frehlich	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Scott Froehlich	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1896	4/5/2023	Scott Hudson	Email	<p>Good afternoon:                      My name is Scott Hudson and I would like to voice my opposition to the State Highway 380 (Option C) Bypass in Collin County/McKinney                      The Option C seems to be the preferred route at the moment and it seem to be the worts option as far as I am concerned. We use the current road for scenic bike rides that end in supporting local businesses. If this option is used it will end our rides as well as.....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• Destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>• Disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• Eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/ threatened species.</li> <li>• Affects and displaces 383% more homes (29 vs. 6), 300% more businesses (16 vs. 4), and more community resources.</li> <li>• Strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider my opposition to Option C of the Bypass.                      Scott Hudson                      214-616-1260</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.
1897	4/20/2023	Scott J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A is the worst and most disruptive route. We support B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1898	3/25/2023	Scott Pertee	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Scott Pertee	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1899	4/20/2023	Scott W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B would be much less impactful to existing homes an businesses.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1900	2/24/2023	Scott Wilder	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1901	2/26/2023	Sean Druhan	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sean Druhan 1103 Saddlebrook Dr McKinney, TX, 75072	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1902	3/7/2023	Sean Kang	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely Sean Kang	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1903	3/29/2023	Selene Meda-Schlamel	Email	NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Selene Meda-Schlamel	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1904	4/20/2023	Shanda C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1905	3/9/2023	Shanda Combs	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1906	3/3/2023	Shanda Eppinette	Email	<p>C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central collin county</p> <p>C eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered , threatened species</p> <p>C Divides Ranchers and Farming Communities</p> <p>C affects and displaces SIGNIFICANTLY more homes businesses and community resources</p> <p>C has the worst traffic performance</p> <p>PLEASE MAKE D the route!! PLEASE.</p> <p>shanda eppinette</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east out of the floodplain. Segment D straddles the floodplain for most of its length. Using bridges to span floodways to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within the mapped 100-year floodplain is part of the design for Segments C and D. With an alignment outside of these areas, more of the roadway would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built, therefore reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1907	4/20/2023	Shane J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to Segment A. As a community, I understand managing growth can be difficult but allowing developers to persuade government agencies for their own gain at the expense of the taxpayer is down right criminal. We all can make the argument about property value, noise, pollution, disruption to current life but how can we justify forcing more small businesses to move and the tax payer to foot the \$100M bill for the benefit of someone's personal farm. Manegait does great things for the special needs community, no argument there, but let's focus on the greater community. It's obvious what the correct choice is because of the major response by these powerful people. The further west the thoroughfare starts, the more relief 380 will get which in turn will allow more future growth and access to DNT and 75 for Prosper, Celina, Weston, Melissa, and Anna. This isn't hard, don't make it.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1908	4/20/2023	Shannon and Tyler Davenport	Email	<p>To whom it may concern:  As McKinney homeowners and taxpayers, we strongly support the TX380 Segment B over Segment A. We live in the Tucker Hill neighborhood so will be significantly personally impacted by the Segment A selection, but our objection goes beyond the impact to our neighborhood. Beyond the obvious concerns of the additional cost to McKinney taxpayers and the safety implications of selecting Segment A, our largest concern is the lack of transparency and reasonable rationale provided when TXDOT chose Segment A as the preferred option. We won't copy and paste the arguments that have been distributed; however, rest assured we echo the sentiments. To select an option that costs more, will likely result in more vehicular accidents both during construction and as a final product, displaces more established businesses, separates a McKinney neighborhood from the city, and creates an environmental and noise impact to existing homeowners who chose the community for its unique outdoor qualities without providing clear rationale brings the entire project into question. We are both retired military and continue to work for the DoD. We moved to McKinney and Tucker Hill just 3 years ago, leaving our country home in Tarrant County drawn to the unique neighborhood allowing outdoor living in which homeowners thrive and close by our son's family that we'll be separated from by a highway if Segment A comes to pass. We spend hours outdoors at the pool, both playgrounds, walking dogs, and on our porch, joined most often by our grandchildren who were our draw to the area. We are pragmatic people - if there were a good explanation for selection of Segment A, we'd give a hearty "aye aye" and move on. But, that would require an explanation of why established residents have less importance than developers and unbuilt homes. It would require an explanation of why the cost is an important aspect of the decision for the eastern segments of the 380 bypass but not for the western segments. It would require an explanation of why the Maingate facility continues to be a factor in the decision when research indicates that selection of Segment B would not result in damage to the facility's mission. It would require an explanation of how a segment with two 90 degree turns would be</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway.</p> <p>In Ladera Residential Phase 1 there are thirty (30) residential homes and the amenities center that are currently under construction and will likely be occupied at the time of ROD issuance. Therefore, those homes will be counted as potential residential displacements. The total number of additional residences in future Ladera phases eventually displaced is expected to total 81 of 244 residential units. TxDOT does not have jurisdiction to halt the progress of developments being built until after the FEIS/ROD has been approved.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>preferable - besides the safety concerns just the traffic impact of that design should make it undesirable. It would require explanation of why the impact to displaced businesses apparently was not a factor. I could go on. Since it appears (based on information from TXDOT) that the selection of Segment A had more to do with input from Prosper residents and a vote of sorts, please place our vote on Segment B, until and unless you provide adequate rationale for the alternative. Thank you. Shannon and Tyler Davenport Tucker Hill Homeowners</p>	<p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>
1909	2/21/2023	Shannon Baker	Online	<p>I am strongly against this bypass all together! Option D impacts less nature than Option C. I vote OPTION D! The peaceful place we've worked so hard to get to, will no longer be peaceful. This bypass will uproot the homes of the deer, eagles, beavers, owls and so many other animals that we are so fortunate to have in our backyards.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1910	4/20/2023	Shannon D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to segment A. This option is more costly and short sighted than segment B</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1911	3/9/2023	Shannon Dusek	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Shannon Dusek 214-726-9252	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1912	3/29/2023	Shannon E	Online	I would like to comment on the sound pollution Segment A will generate & adversely affect the communities of Tucker Hill & Stonebridge. Tucker Hill specifically was designed to be a "front porch" community, and a unique development within the city of McKinney. Many neighbors have commented that the sound studies TXDOT performed are inadequate. I implore TXDOT to revisit this very important issue as sound pollution has harmful health effects & will most definitely severely limit residents' enjoyment of the active outdoor lifestyle we are accustomed to. At this point, I would much rather this mess of a bypass project be shelved permanently. I certainly do not want years of road construction through McKinney, nor do I want a major highway on top of two very unique neighborhoods in McKinney. At the very least, Segment A must include extensive sound barriers & any other mitigation measures to drastically reduce the traffic noise we will be subjected to if the bypass project proceeds.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.  It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.
1913	4/20/2023	Shannon E	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. The segment B option costs less and less disruptive to well established McKinney neighborhoods!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1914	2/26/2023	Shannon Etier	Online	As a resident of Tucker Hill in McKinney I do not support the "Option A" alignment. This decision puts a major highway on the doorstep of our "front porch" community which is unique to McKinney. Not only will we have the noise and pollution from construction to contend with for years, we will then be subjected to the noise and pollution of the increased traffic moving through our area. If option A is the final decision, why is our neighborhood not at least provided sound barrier walls to help insulate us from the noise we will undoubtedly hear? Furthermore Tucker Hill already has limited ingress/ egress, so my concern for unimpeded access to the neighborhood during construction is of high concern. I am still hopeful the "Option B" alignment will be looked at closely as I feel it is less intrusive to established neighborhoods and businesses and it is less expensive.	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill.</p> <p>It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p>
1915	3/14/2023	Shannon Gidney	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Shannon Gidney Sales Manager/Designer Follow me on Instagram: @designershannongidneyibb Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1916	3/30/2023	Shannon LaGrave	Email	Dear Stephen Endres and TXDOT, This letter is to oppose Segment C of the proposed 380 bypass in the McKinney area. I, Shannon La Grave OPPOSE using Segment C of the 380 bypass. I personally know families in the proposed Segment C who are valued in the McKinney community and have been youth leaders and community volunteers. There are a large number of homes and residences in the current proposed segment C. It appears that the alternate proposal of segment D would affect or displace fewer homeowners. I would prefer to see Segment D selected because D impacts fewer residents. Thank you for considering the alternate segment D. Sincerely, Shannon LaGrave Resident and voter in Collin County, TX	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT selected Segment C over Segment D because Segment C minimizes impacts to 100-year floodplains and regulatory floodways, therefore, requiring TxDOT to build much less of the roadway on elevated (bridge) structure. Segment C is also expected to draw traffic off FM 1827 by providing better connections to local roadways, would impact fewer major utilities, and would cost less to construct than Segment D.</p> <p>It is important to note that Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1917	3/15/2023	Shannon McLinden	Email	<p>Good afternoon, I would like to oppose Route C of the proposed 380 Bypass project. If you could consider Route D it would potentially displace fewer businesses and homes, and destroy less forest and grasslands - the green areas of the county including horse properties are such rarities! Thank you, Shannon McLinden Founder &amp; CEO FarmHouse Fresh [REDACTED] Toll free: 888-773-9626 Fax: 214-705-7754 8797 County Road 858, McKinney, Texas 75071 FarmHouseFreshGoods.com</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>
1918	3/24/2023	Shannon Patterson	Email	<p>I am a homeowner in Prosper and a Realtor in the north DFW area. I strongly oppose the construction of Segment B for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. This proposed route would go through Mane Gait, an equestrian non-profit that has served the local community for years. There is not the land that is centrally located that the non-profit could move to. Businesses can easily relocate, but this non-profit can't. I would like you to kindly consider implementing Segment A as the preferred option for the Bypass. Warm regards, Shannon Patterson (214)799-5266</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment A, and opposition of Segment B is noted. Segment B as presented at the Public Hearing would not have required acquisition of property from ManeGait. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which does not include Segment B.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1919	4/20/2023	Shannon S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose option A and vote for option B!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1920	3/16/2023	Sharaya Block	Email	<p>To whom it may concern,                      I am writing to express my opposition to Route C on the TX-DOT Spur 399 extension project. Route C affects and displaces significantly more homes, businesses, and community resources than route D. It also divides the residential and farming/ranching communities that make this area of Collin County unique. Perhaps even more concerning, Route C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County. It destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodland and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie than Route D. Not surprisingly, Route C is also strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. While Route C may be the more economical option in the short-term, Route D will preserve more developable land for future growth in Collin County by making use of flood plain space that is otherwise unusable. Sincerely,                      Sharaya Block</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
1921	2/20/2023	Shari Benson	Email	I vote a big NO ON ROUTE C!! Not unique by nature!	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1922	3/15/2023	Sharon Davis	Email	Mr. Andres, Thank you for the recent presentations regarding US 380 from Coit to FM1827. Our family's desired opinion for the future US 380 in Prosper, TX, continues to be for US 380 to remain on US 380. We appreciate TXDOT's preferred Blue alternative supports our and the Town of Prosper's recommendation. Thank you, Sharon Davis 3761 Dogwood Dr Prosper, TX 75078 Sent from my iPad	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
1923	4/20/2023	Sharon G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This is devastating to our neighborhood and there is a better option. Please choose plan B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1924	3/7/2023	Sharon Gibney	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sharon Gibney	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1925	4/20/2023	Sharon H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A -- too expensive and too intrusive. Yes to Segment B!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1926	3/9/2023	Sharon Mathews	Email	I am a resident of McKinney, TX. I oppose Segment A in the TXDOT US 380 I strongly support Segment B Thank you ! Sharon Mathews	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1927	3/7/2023	Sharon Smith	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1928	3/9/2023	Shea Darling	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Have a blessed day!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1929	3/15/2023	Shelley Jannati	Email	Good afternoon Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Best regards, Shelley Jannati	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1930	3/16/2023	Sheri De Guia	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1931	4/20/2023	Sheri M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. Yes to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1932	2/24/2023	Sherri Eubank	Email	<p>Mr. Endres:  I am writing to get your help and support of Segment D as the preferred route with the McKinney TxDOT Bypass. Segment D has always been the preferred route. We were totally shocked and unprepared when a month ago, they switched it to Segment C. The environmental study was completed and the segment choice was released mid-January. We felt very safe that it would stay Segment D since it was an environmental study. Texas Parks and Wildlife doesn't like either route but they strongly oppose Segment C and their preferred route is Segment D. On Segment C, there is the largest remaining forest in central Collin County. Segment C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands. It also contains wetlands that are verified on federal maps. There are river otters, a heron rookery in numerous trees, alligator snapping turtles, migratory and non-migratory birds, etc. There are mature hardwoods that have been there for years. One of the largest Elms in the state resides in this forest. It is estimated to be over 220 years old. These wetlands are suitable habitat for many threatened species and a large area will be eliminated if C is used. The forest, floodplains and wetlands are a totally different habitat on Segment C than the floodplains on Segment D. The Segment D floodplains are cultivated and contain minimal natural habitat for the wildlife. The floodplains on certain sections of D can remain unharmed and allow easy flow of water with bridges. Part of Segment D can also be built with less expensive berms that run beside an existing roadway. One of the most surprising aspects to me is that Segment C has more residences and businesses affected than Segment D. There are also more community resources on Segment C. When reviewing Segment A, three of the most important aspects of the choice is that it impacts fewer residences. Using that criteria, Segment D should be the preferred route. Segment A was also more expensive than Segment B and it was chosen. Trying to make sense out of the TxDOT's preferred choice of C is just not possible. We need your help returning to your preferred choice of Segment D.</p> <p>Respectfully,  Sherri Eubank  2371 CR338  McKinney, TX 75071  214-250-4889</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
1933	4/20/2023	Sherri W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option B more direct, less disruptive to current residents/businesses.	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
1934	3/9/2023	Sherry Doty Balkovec	Email	<p>March 9, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden o McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in ;less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Sincerely Sherry Doty Balkovec</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1935	4/20/2023	Sherry G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1936	4/20/2023	Sherry S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I totally understand the need for something to be done with the traffic on 380; however, no one can understand how anyone could feel that segment A would be the better choice. Homes on Grassmere where 380 Rt A will run on the East side of Tucker Hill will be only 1,628 feet from this the highway. This section is a raised 8-lane with frontage roads. Homes facing east will not only have traffic noise from the below grade roadway but now will have new noise in the back and side of their homes. My understanding is that TxDOT did not even test or report on noise abatement for this and have stated to us only homes that are within 500 feet of the roadway are eligible. The damage being done to our Tucker Hill and Stonebridge communities is disgraceful . I too strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, support of Segment B and opposition of Segment A is noted.  TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050.
1937	3/15/2023	Shruti Narsana	Email	Hi Mr. Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Shruti Narsana	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1938	4/20/2023	Sierra F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A. I thought we already voted on this. Why wasn't this issue raised in the City's CIP? If it were these plans would have already been in place. Someone drop the ball?	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with FHWA NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.  While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1939	3/7/2023	Sonny and Lou Phillips	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sonny and Lou Phillips Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1940	3/7/2023	Sonny Phillips	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. THE 2ND AMMENDMENT WASN'T WRITTEN AFTER A HUNTING TRIP. IT WAS WRITTEN AFTER A BUNCH OF FARMERS AND BLACKSMITHS FOUGHT OFF THE LARGEST EMPIRE THE WORLD HAS EVER SEEN. Sonny	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1941	3/29/2023	Srinivas Amaram	Online	Bloomridge community on the intersection of CR 161 (Ridge Rd) and CR 123 (Bloomdale Rd) is severely impacted with the noise, emission, and lights. The proposed highway is right next to our community negatively impact our lives with noise. Please consider fine tuning to install high barrier walls to eliminate noise at least 30 inch walls.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Bloomridge subdivision does not meet TxDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements for a noise barrier.
1942	2/25/2023	Srivatsa Kandalai	Online	I oppose the proposal as noise is safety is a concern for the residents of Bloomridge as there is no noise barrier wall. Considering the latest developments of housing communities, any previous noise surveys are not correct. Please consider our safety and health concerns.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Heatherwood neighborhood currently has a brick privacy wall or barrier of some type that would reduce noise; therefore the area does not meet feasibility and reasonableness requirements. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1943	4/20/2023	Stacey H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose the Segment A option. Segment B, as the less expensive and less disruptive option, would be the better choice.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1944	2/25/2023	Stacey Jacobson	Online	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1945	4/20/2023	Stacey S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No ! Use the outer loop.	Your comment is noted. Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.
1946	3/15/2023	Stacy Finney	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Stacy Finney Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1947	2/21/2023	Stacy Gozzola	Online	I would prefer D over C	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
1948	4/20/2023	Stacy H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Save StoneBridge Ranch	Your comment is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1949	3/16/2023	Stacy Henderson	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1950	3/14/2023	Stacy Pierson	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Stacy Pierson	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1951	3/14/2023	Stacy Powell	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Stacy Powell McKinney, TX resident and homeowner S T A C Y P O W E L L ( 2 1 4 ) 5 7 8 - 0 1 3 1	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1952	4/20/2023	Stacy S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to A. Yes to B. Segment A costs more, is 1 mile longer, requires 1 more grade-separated interchange, has 5 more major utility conflicts that would cost \$49M to relocate, will displace many businesses and be detrimental to Stonebridge, Tucker Hill and surrounding home owners and 380 businesses. Segment A will impact 12.9 acres of statewide important farmland, will increase noise and pollution levels near front porch communities, will threaten several protected species in their habitats, has 2 high-risk hazardous material sites, increases the likelihood of accidents, will put peoples lives at risk when seconds matter most- construction &amp; the Segment A design will increase the amount of time vs now that affected residence, guests, area business owners, employees and patrons can get to the closest ER or have emergency rescue assistance (police, fire, rescue...) reach them. McKinney shouldn't bear the entire 380 bypass. Segment B is the way to go &amp; contains more empty land that can be designed around, is less disruptive &amp; less costly.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p>
1953	4/5/2023	Stacy St. George	Email	<p>Segment A is too costly &amp; will put more lives at risk. Choose Segment B                      Segment A costs approximately \$200M more than Segment B                      Segment A is 1 mile longer than Segment B                      Segment A requires 1 more grade-separated interchange than Segment B                      Segment A has 5 more major utility conflicts than Segment B &amp; would cost \$49M more to relocate these major and minor utilities than Segment B                      Segment A will displace 15 businesses (Segment B= none) &amp; 2 residences                      Segment A costs \$45-95M more to acquire right of way required acres                      Segment A area impacts development planned &amp; several existing, established and thriving master planned home communities                      Segment A has 2 HIGH risk hazardous material sites (4 hazardous sites total) with potential to impact the community (Segment B has none)                      Segment A will threaten several protected species &amp; their habitats                      Segment A curve increases the likelihood of accidents (especially in rainy or icy weather) including hazardous spills which could gravely impact residents, animals, streams (including Wilson Creek Tributary)....                      Segment A will impact 12.9 acres of Statewide Important Farmland                      Segment A will increase noise and pollution levels (which can negatively impact mental &amp; physical health) for Tucker Hill residents, nearby Stonebridge residents, other surrounding planned communities, individual homes and a honey farm.                      Segment A will be detrimental to Tucker Hill property values and 380 business'                      Segment A will put Tucker Hill lives at risk when seconds matter most. Construction will impede Tucker Hill residents, guests, area business employees and patrons from safely and quickly getting to the ER in as timely manner as now and will also impede everyone's safety as it will reduce emergency rescue access (fire, ambulance, police....). Seconds count in an emergency. Lives should not be put at risk. Those in Tucker Hill could become entrapped in their own community with the lack of life saving, tax payer emergency resources. Tucker Hill has only one entrance</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified; however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>and exit with a traffic light and another entrance/ exit a few feet down which does not have a light and is more of a “just in case” opening. Construction will back up traffic on an already dangerous stretch of road and intersection and the final convoluted Segment A design will delay emergency resources vs the current direct route for those at Tucker Hill. It currently takes me 6 minutes to get to the Baylor, Scott &amp; White ER door. Prosper wants to enjoy the benefits of the bypass without contributing land wise or financially. Why should McKinney carry the entire 380 bypass load/ burden? Go with B through Prosper. Do what’s right ethically, morally, fiscally. Prosper= more empty land that can be designed around. McKinney= established. As city manager, Paul Grimes said “We have communities like Tucker Hill where the bypass will go right through their front door... (and then) cut them off from the incorporated area of the city that they’re so much a part of. You don’t have any situation like that in Prosper.” McKinney doesn’t have the funding needed- 10% of the cost of right away acquisition and utility relocation for portions of the project. There’s no ADA impact on Main Gate, per the study and Segment B is 100 feet from Main Gate and Darling property. Council members &amp; Darling’s Main Gate board members shouldn’t dictate or influence TX Dot votes. An outside, unbiased decision maker should be brought in that cares about safety and costs to existing homeowners and business. Politics is getting in the way of what’s best. Shouldn’t an investigative reporter/news organization, investigate and inform Texas representatives and taxpayers why the state of Texas is spending an additional \$200 million of taxpayer money? Segment A keeps shifting closer to Tucker Hill, an established residential, front porch community. Protect and honor what you have by going with Segment B through Prosper.</p> <p>I am NOT employed by TX Dot I do NOT do business with TX Dot Stacy St. George 7605 Eastwick Ave McKinney TX 75071 Cell: 925-499-6137</p>	<p>design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices</p>
1954	4/20/2023	Stacy W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>The increased noise, decrease in property value, higher cost to taxpayers, displacement of businesses, and decreased safety in my neighborhood makes option A the wrong choice for everyone.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1955	3/9/2023	Stacy Weller	Online	<p>I am a resident of Tucker Hill, and I passionately urge you to choose option B over option A. Option A would have a significant negative impact on my community and family. It would dramatically reduce the value of my home, decrease the safety of our neighborhood, and cost the taxpayers of Texas much, much more. Option B impacts significantly fewer homes, leaving less people with a dramatic loss in home value. This is not a trivial thing to consider as a person's home is their greatest asset and can often be the difference between surviving hard times, and financial ruin. The loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars in value could destroy many families. Please consider the individual impact of every homeowner before making your final decision. The best choice needs to be a balance of individual impact, overall cost, and community impact. When all three are added together, Option B is the clear choice. Thank you.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B and opposition of Segment A, is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code.</p> <p>TxDOT selected Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
1956	2/21/2023	Stanley and Marjorie Youngblood	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Enders                      We are providing you with our feedback of subject:                      We support the DEIS SEGMENT A route alternative as follows:                      1) There are eight existing or under construction developments at the southeast corner of Custer &amp; First Street that are preserved with Segment A alternative.                      2) Segment A is consistent with the city of Prosper resolutions opposing other all other alternatives that would cut through the southeast border of Prosper. Prosper has consistently supported an LAR along the existing 380 right away.                      Respectfully,                      Stanley &amp; Marjorie Youngblood                      4231 Glacier Point Court                      Prosper, TX 75078</p>	<p>Your comment and support of the project is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1957	4/20/2023	Stefani L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The decision between choosing Proposed segment A vs Proposed segment B CANNOT be based on public opinion regarding the MainGait Horse facility!! ALL points of comparison between the 2 proposed options make choosing Segment B the OBVIOUS route (based on COST, engineering feasibility, safety of route, traffic flow addressing the congestion at the intersection of 380 & Custer, impact to existing neighborhoods vs undeveloped land, utility complications,). At some point, the "popularity" & public campaign of ManeGait HAS to be set aside and facts need to be the deciding factors. Segment B makes sense!!	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1958	3/13/2023	Stefani Lear	Email	I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. The same extension should apply to those affected by Option D. Stefani Lear 2754 Majestic Avenue, McKinney	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
1959	4/19/2023	Stefani Lear	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, My husband and I have been McKinney homeowners and taxpayers for years and I find TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of political maneuvering, campaigning, and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait that ostensibly has swayed TxDOT's position, and I publicly condemn these actions as unethical and improper.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1960	3/17/2023	Stella Frances van Tassell	Email	<p>Good evening, Steve. The purpose of this email is to provide input into TXDOT's final decision about the path for turning 380 into a freeway. I attended the informational meeting at Rhea Mill church and talked with several representatives and affected residents while there. I also viewed the numerous posters and table maps provided. As a resident of Red Bud Estates, on the south side of 380, just one mile west of Custer, my property backs onto 380. As I've commented before, I don't understand why the alternative route (the one TXDOT does not prefer) is not the best route for the west portion. Extending the freeway through Coit all the way to Ridge makes no sense to me, when the other option avoids the disruptions to so many people and cost up to 2 million dollars less, according to one of the posters. I can't imagine why the state would prefer to spend that much more money when there is an alternative. One representative I spoke with assured me that the plan is to take the existing TXDOT right of way at the back of my property; however, no one could answer this question: Does that then mean that new right of way would be taken, thus consuming much more of my property than you already have? The bottom line is that I urge you and your team and advisors to reconsider what you prefer as the route. I recognize that the alternative route that goes northward from Coit would take part of the property of the wealthy horse farm owners but, no matter which route ends up being chosen, some people will lose part or all of their property. My vote is to choose the alternative route that moves northward from Coit and will cost taxpayers less money. At the very least, if you are not willing to change your mind, I beg you to inform the city of McKinney leaders now so no more permits can be provided to small business owners who plan to build along 380, east of Custer. As your poster mentioned, already four or five new businesses would require being moved, given the route TXDOT prefers. Thank you for reading and considering my input.</p> <p>Stella Frances van Tassell 13955 Red Oak Circle North McKinney TX 75071 (In Red Bud Estates)</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>The Schematic Design does not show any proposed ROW acquisition from your property.</p>
1961	2/17/2023	Steph Potter	Online	<p>Project C and D should be removed and reworked so that the new 380 would run straight between bypass one and bypass two. the dip down to the existing 380 created by both project C and Project D is a waste of money/resources that creates unnecessary interchanges that will cause congestion and grid lock.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative (as well as all Build Alternatives) effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p>
1962	2/25/2023	Stephanie Adkins	Online	<p>I agree with this option to keep 380 on 380 through prosper</p>	<p>Your comment and support of the project is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1963	4/20/2023	Stephanie C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B will cost less and displace fewer residents/businesses in Collin County. It is the overall best choice for the 380 Bypass.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.
1964	3/16/2023	Stephanie Gregory	Email	Stephen, Please consider the loss of homes, businesses, and community resources when you vote. People in Collin County do not want to lose their beautiful land when there is another way. This applies to the route through Princeton, as well. I do not understand why you do not widen an already existing road instead of taking people's land. The businesses on 380 would benefit, and the people who designed their home around their land can keep what they bought. I know some people would have to move, but they would not lose their way of life. They already live in the city by a busy road. They chose that. At least with route D less people would be affected. I believe this continued land stealing is a government overreach in power. I am very disappointed in how this has been handled. Thank you for your service to our community, Stephanie Gregory	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.  According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.  The Green Alternative, or Segment F, from Coit Road to FM 1827 (also referred to as "keeping 380 on 380" or expanding the existing US 380 to a freeway), was identified during the Feasibility Study, but ultimately was not carried forward for further analysis after because it would have displaced more than 30 residents and 200 businesses.
1965	4/19/2023	Stephanie Johnson	Email	Dear Mr. Endres, My husband and I submitted comments previously regarding TxDOT's choice for 380 of Segment A over Segment B and the mitigation of damage to our community of Tucker Hill. As a result of substantial additional information coming to my attention, I now add the following comments and questions. Because Segment A follows the existing 380 route further than Segment B, the disruption to homes and businesses during the long construction period will be significantly greater with Segment A than with Segment B. Our home is close to the front of the development and therefore will be impacted significantly by the noise, dirt, and pollution.  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.  <i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
1966	4/20/2023	Stephanie M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1967	3/29/2023	Stephanie McGary	Online	Oppose Segment B	Your comment and opposition of Segment B is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 into the Town of Prosper.
1968	3/15/2023	Stephanie Weatherby	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Stephanie weatherby 6501 alderbrook place McKinney texas 75071 Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1969	2/25/2023	Stephen Bishop	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks. Stephen Bishop	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1970	3/28/2023	Stephen Lyman	Email	Dear Sirs, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Stephen Lyman Wren Creek Stonebridge Ranch Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1971	4/20/2023	Stephen R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I believe the segment A will adversely affect several neighborhoods including my own. This will result in more noise and air pollution for more residents. This will adversely affect home values for many more owners compared to the option to drop in just West of Custer where there are fewer homes and business.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1972	4/20/2023	Stephen R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1973	2/20/2023	Stephen Remington	Online	As a resident of Tucker Hill subdivision in McKinney, my family and I strictly and overwhelmingly oppose the blue alignment which empties the new bypass next to our serene neighborhood and over Stonebridge Drive. This will have a negative impact on our air and noise pollution, and adversely impact our property values by placing freeway and service roads in front of and encroaching into our neighborhood. The alignment that goes north of Tucker hill through a virtually uninhabited areas and across fewer homes and business into the East side of Prosper would be the least disruptive option.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Segment B impacts can be found on the Segment Analysis Matrix posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> .



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1974	3/7/2023	Stephen Shapiro	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1975	4/20/2023	Steve and Janell P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	We support Segment B. Why spend more money for Segment A. It makes no sense.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1976	3/7/2023	Steve and Janell Pennington	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Why does the State want to spend more money for option A? It does not make any sense along with the other reasons ....destroying fewer businesses and homes. I am sick over the possibility of the state implementing Segment A. Please listen to the voices of McKinney residents especially those impacted in Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill Sincerely, Steve and Janell Pennington Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.  The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.
1977	3/7/2023	Steve and Jessica Murray	Email	Dear Mr. Endres As a homeowner and resident of Stonebridge Ranch in McKinney, my wife and I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US380 Bypass from Coit RD to FM1827. We believe that TXDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy less homes and businesses and result in less disruption to the 36,000 residents of Stonebridge Ranch and thousands of residents of McKinney. We strongly urge you and TXDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for this US380 Bypass. My understanding is that this was what was originally discussed with many in the community and this change in direction is not only the wrong decision, it's also challenging everyone's faith and believe in our state government. Sincerely Steve and Jessica Murray 7117 Langmuir DR McKinney, TX 75071	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.  The Preferred Alternative was a part of the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study completed in 2020 and subsequently part of the current DEIS. Although TxDOT recommended a single alignment at the conclusion of the Feasibility Study, there were some other alternatives that are also reasonable, and those alternatives required more detailed study during the environmental review (NEPA) phase of the project, including alternatives that were eliminated during the Feasibility Study. Because this phase of the project involves a more detailed evaluation and collection of new

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>information, it is possible that data being gathered in the environmental review process could change previously studied alignments or lead TxDOT to consider new alternatives. Thus, after the completion of the evaluation in the DEIS, Segment A, E, and C became the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>An example of this is that during the Feasibility Study when TxDOT evaluated environmental impacts it was done at desktop level review where subject matter experts evaluate available state and federal resources to quantify impacts. During the development of the EIS, TxDOT sent team members to the project area to update or validate the assumptions made on things like wetlands, floodplains, historic properties.</p>
1978	3/10/2023	Steve and Joell Clink	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Steve and Joelle Clink</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1979	4/18/2023	Steve and Marianne Richardson	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,                      As a resident of Tucker Hill, I am concerned about a number of the problems the proposed segment A will bring , and don't believe the vetting process addresses ;                      How will emergency services be accomplished when construction starts and there is still only one street of egress?                      How was air pollution actually measured for our community , where were the testing monitors placed? How were they going to predict the pollution during the construction?                      Did the EIS studies take into account native animal and plant species that will be displaced? What about the new beaver dams along Wilson creek?                      Was the parking displacement in Harvard Park taken into account? Where will the business parking go? It will go into Tucker Hill and take already precious little existing residential parking. Where in the EIS studies is this addressed?                      Finally, how was the potential added cost of over \$200,000,000.00 over segment B justified.                      Sincerely                      Steve &amp; Marianne Richardson</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT considered both impacts to wildlife and habitat as well as to vegetation in Section 3.11 of the DEIS.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					The current design shows that TxDOT would likely need to acquire the land where the last row of parking is for the Harvard Park parking lot. TxDOT does not anticipate that additional right-of-way beyond what is described in the DEIS will be needed for the project. If the property owner chooses to reconfigure parking due to the TxDOT ROW acquisition, they would have to do so on their own property. During the TxDOT ROW acquisition process, TxDOT hires a third party to appraise and assess any potential damage and if the building can still operate with its original purpose.
1980	2/27/2023	Steve Chappell	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas, I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Segment A doesn't make sense for two very important reasons: it's more expensive and less of a bypass. Steve Chappell	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1981	4/20/2023	Steve D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Oppose segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1982	3/7/2023	Steve Daigle	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
1983	2/6/2023	Steve Donnell	Segment C Petition	Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3 1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative) 2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons: - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1984	2/25/2023	Steve Lotz	Email	<p>Hi Stephen As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for reconsidering. Anything you can do would be greatly appreciated. Steve Lotz</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1985	2/25/2023	Steve Meyer	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of Mckinney Texas, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of segment A and support segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you. Steve Meyer 1208 Canyon Wren Dr. Mckinney, TX 75071 214-458-5961	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
1986	4/20/2023	Steve P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment A is much more expensive, more dangerous, and impacts more residents and businesses. The homes going up near the path of segment B should be stopped, as should the building of business units on 380 where route A would go if it were to be foolishly implemented. It is clear that route B makes more sense from nearly every angle. Route B is the way to safely go.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
1987	4/20/2023	Steve R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	in what reality does a rich developer\'s horse hobby farm justify a \$100 million plus tax payer cost addition, along with environmental and noise pollution?neither common sense nor logical.	Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1988	2/20/2023	Steve Richardson	Online	<p>The proposed "Preferred Alternative A " is at least \$100 million more than 'B' . In what perversion of logic does a rich, politically connected former developer's horse ranch hobby dictate fiscal decisions? It was stated in TXDOT's own EIS that in no way did the 'B' alternative adversely affect the quality of life on the hobby ranch , but yet one entity was able to swing the the 'B' to 'A' based on the contention that somehow his horses would suffer? And this is worth \$100 million ?. Shame to all who caved in the this ridiculous notion! A concerted investigation into how this boondoggle has come to pass, and how the extra cost can possibly be allowed to pass.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
1989	2/6/2023	Steve Williams	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
1990	3/9/2023	Steven and Michelle Kordak	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Steven and Michelle Kordak 8725 Abbingdon Place McKinney, 75072 Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
1991	3/23/2023	Steven Clay	Email	<p>To Mr. Stephen Endres and those it concerns, I am a McKinney business owner, a Prosper homeowner and a daily commuter on 380 and I SUPPORT SEGMENT A ONLY for the 380 bypass option. My family and I are in a unique position because we can see this from both McKinney and Prosper viewpoints and opinions. However, when reviewing the detailed information TxDOT has provided all citizens of both cities and after reviewing the DEIS, Segment A is 100% clearly the best and only option for everyone's futures. Let's use our collective common sense and stand with the DEIS study that clearly shows Segment A as the most viable option and put this issue to rest. I ask you to NOT punish the many because of a few! Citizens in every town and subdivision along the 380 corridors are upset and being pitted against one another because of this expansion project. It's time to officially close the discussions on this and move forward with Segment A! I will say it again...my family and I support Segment A ONLY for this expansion project. Please Do The Right Thing! Finalize Segment A as the final decision, close the discussions and let's all move forward. Respectfully, Steven Clay Prosper homeowner, McKinney Business Owner and daily commuter</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment A is noted.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1992	3/15/2023	Steven Lenney	Online	<p>380 Bypass Comments            Construction Phase Traffic:            Regarding Segment A vs. Segment B, the comparison used for the recommendation is lacking because it fails to address the impact to traffic on US 380 during the period of construction, which based on the fly through video most recently shared, will be substantial. Segment B could be built from the NE to the SW, with the it-in to the current 380 taking place during the final stage of construction, which would allow traffic to flow normally for the majority of the construction project. Contrast that with Segment A, which impacts a much larger extent of the existing road, creating a substantial impact to road traffic during the construction phase. Since the main project objective, as we have been told, is to improve traffic on 380, the feasibility comparison cannot be complete without comparing the impact of the project's execution on the end it pursues. The absence of this comparison on the draft EIS is substantial grounds to revisit the decision.</p> <p>Wildlife habitat:            Property 2689146 is a county-designated wildlife habitat with an active management plan. The area is home to a substantial population of coyotes, active songbirds, waterfowl, deer, bobcats, and beavers. The robust beaver population creates a natural wetland that serves as a habitat unique to the area in that it is accessible to nature enthusiasts and large enough to support the numerous species identified above. The wetland ecosystem created naturally in this area is an important flood control measure. The EIS is performed in the absence of assessing the net impact on watershed due to construction on the Wilson Creek corridor to the SE of the proposed project. Reducing the wetland area in the proposed development region will put additional strain on the downstream areas of Tucker Hill that are also increasingly narrowed and hardened with concrete. AN updated holistic floodplain analysis must be undertaken to ascertain the feasibility of safely construction this project, given development outside of its boundaries.            Steven Lenney</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Based on our research of Collin County Appraisal District records, Property 2689146 is owned by SLC McKinney Partners LP C/O Southern Land Company. There is no mention of Collin County ownership or use. The majority of this property is outside of the proposed ROW, so direct impacts would be limited. Across this property the Blue Alternative would be constructed on bridge, elevated over the floodplain, wetland features, and Wilson Creek. During the development of alignments, TxDOT evaluated the property to identify habitats, possible protected species, and water features. Because no direct impacts would occur to these features outside of the proposed ROW, no additional study was required. The evaluation of cumulative effects - the effects of this US 380 project in combination with current and reasonably foreseeable future actions - is included in Section 3.16 of the DEIS. Additional hydraulic modeling may be conducted during final design to refine the placement of bridge piers and further minimize impacts to the Wilson Creek floodplain.</p>
1993	4/20/2023	Steven M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1994	4/20/2023	Steven R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	100 MILLION MORE TO APPEASE A RICH DELVELOPER\’S HORSE HOBBY?	Your comment is noted.
1995	4/20/2023	Steven S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Route A places a 12 lane highway within 1/2 mile of my home and will devalue it greatly.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.
1996	4/3/2023	Stonebridge Ranch Community Association	Email	Dear Mr. Endres The Board of Directors of Stonebridge Ranch Community Association, a 9,400-home master-planned community, voted unanimously to make an official statement adamantly opposing TxDOT’s preferred Segment A of the "Blue Alternative" and continue to support Segment B. Please see attached written petition that has been signed by homeowners and citizens of McKinney, TX. Thank you for your time, Communications Stonebridge Ranch Community Association	Your official statement is noted. The petition has been received and is being incorporated into this Public Hearing summary.
1997	2/26/2023 2/23/2023	Stonebridge Ranch Community Association Resolution	Email (1) Written Comment Form (1)	Stephen Attached is a resolution passed by our Board of Directors at is Feb 23, 2023 meeting opposing Segment A and Supporting Segment B of the Blue Alternative preferred Route proposed by TxDot in January of 2023. Jon Dell’Antonia Board President Stonebridge Ranch Community Association  Resolution on TxDOT’s 380 Bypass Project Feb 23, 2023 As President of the Board of Directors of Stonebridge Ranch Community Association, I represent our Board of Directors who were elected to make decisions that are in the best interest of the 9461 residences of Stonebridge Ranch and its 36,000 residents who live in McKinney. In a unanimous vote of the Board of Directors of Stonebridge Ranch at its meeting on February 23, 2023, on behalf of our Associations 36,000 residents, we hereby make an official statement adamantly opposed to TxDOT’s Preferred Alternative Segment A of the “Blue Alternative” and continue to Support Segment B as the best option available for this project. It is the least disruptive to businesses and homes and the least expensive option available as evidenced by the Segment Analysis developed by TxDOT in March of 2022 and February 2023. Our opposition to Segment A of the “Blue Alternative” is based on the following facts presented by TxDOT in their February 2023 Announcement: 1. Segment A destroys 27 businesses, 12 displacements and 2 homes currently. It will likely be more than that by the time the project is constructed whereas Segment B destroys no business, 7 displacements, and 5 homes.	The resolution, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.  Right-of-way acquisition estimates were calculated using Collin County Appraisal District as a guide to come up with square footage cost. All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled “The Purchase of Right of Way,” and “Relocation Assistance,” are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Individual property acquisition cost and relocation assistance will be evaluated based on fair market value determined by an independent third-party appraiser. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.  TxDOT is working closely with the City of McKinney to determine the cost of acquiring right-of-way. TxDOT will continue to assist the City in identifying funding opportunities. This project is currently partially funded for construction and cannot let for construction until funding is identified;

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>2. The cost of Segment A right of way acquisition estimated today is \$957.8 million compared to \$888.8 million for Segment B. It is likely to reach more than \$1 billion by the time the project is constructed based on current construction projects which are not counted in the current TxDOT estimates.</p> <p>3. The proposed Blue Alternative which includes Segment A calls for \$120 million from the City of McKinney for right of way acquisition which will be an unplanned tax burden to McKinney taxpayers. The amount of that tax burden quite likely will increase as the cost of ROW acquisitions and related expenses increase.</p> <p>4. Segment A will have a significant detrimental impact on Stonebridge Ranch and Tucker Hill which border the proposed construction of Segment A. It will create major traffic disruption, increased noise, and increased health and environmental problems, not to mention the impact on schools, morning and afternoon traffic, and school zones divided by US380 Segment A.</p> <p>To reiterate, our Board, on behalf of our residents, has unanimously voted to support Project 380 Segment-B that crosses Custer Road North of 380 and enters Highway 380 West of Custer Road and oppose Project 380 Segment -A of the "Blue Alternative".</p> <p>Respectfully we are requesting the City Council to pass a new resolution Supporting Segment B and Opposing Segment A or TxDOT's recent preferred Blue Alignment route alternative for the 380 bypass project. Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter and our position.</p> <p>Jon Dell'Antonia Board President Stonebridge Ranch Community Association 6201 Virginia Parkway McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>however, right-of-way acquisition can proceed even if the project is not funded for construction.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,</li> <li>-depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and</li> <li>-providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</li> </ul> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
1998	3/9/2023	Sue Rump	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. It is important to note Segment A has fewer potential home displacements in comparison to Segment B and results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.
1999	4/20/2023	Sue V	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	YES TO SEGMENT B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
2000	4/20/2023	Susan A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	This construction puts undue traffic, crime & pollution stress on the area where we wlive. There is an easy alternative that affects fewer people.	Your comment is noted.
2001	2/18/2023	Susan Bates	Email	Route C would tragicallyand negatively impact several friends of mine. These folks positively impact the community providing theraputic riding, church and community riding and events, lical hat fornrescue animals, and so much more. It would run through all their front pastures, completely destroy their riding arena and honey bee yard, and it's less than 100 feet from homes and barns. I support Route D, which goes through the flood plain and disrupts only 7 homes as opposed to the 29 homes on Route C. Sincerely, Susan Bates	Your comment, opposition of Segment C and support of Segment D is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.
2002	3/16/2023	Susan Bates	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2003	4/20/2023	Susan C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2004	3/16/2023	Susan Cane	Email	I am writing today to express my concern regarding the diversion on Coit Rd. Since moving to Whitley Place in 2017 we have endured many changes to our environment. As a cancer patient I'm concerned about the air quality in our neighborhood. We have already seen the widening of Custer Road and the influx of traffic that it has resulted in. Also the additional expansion of First Street to accommodate two New Schools which already puts more vehicles on this road. I understand that we expected our community to grow but to expand a road to accommodate a community far away from ours is just wrong. Please take my comments into consideration for this project. Thank You Susan Cane	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.
2005	4/20/2023	Susan D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2006	3/23/2023	Susan Hearst	Email	Hi Mr. Endres, Thank you for providing the opportunity for me to comment on the 380 Bypass plans. I live in Timbercreek, which is located just south of Bloomdale Rd., off of Hardin. It is distressing to envision a 6 or 8 lane highway just north of my home. At night I can hear traffic from 75 when I sit in the backyard. With a new highway, I will hear noise from two directions. When I read about the planned route, I have never seen any information regarding noise abatement. My question is: Why can't this road be constructed further north, on unoccupied land? It appears to me that Bloomdale Rd. is the edge of the prairie, with a lot of vacant land to the north. Or, why can't the existing 380 be enhanced (like 635) with an express lane above or below??? I can only hope that the proposed route is put up for vote in Collin County. Thank you for your patience, Susan Hearst Sent from Mail for Windows	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. Noise mitigation would not be considered reasonable and feasible at your location per TxDOT Guidelines. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Heatherwood neighborhood currently has a brick privacy wall or barrier of some type that would reduce noise; therefore the area does not meet feasibility and reasonableness requirements. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.  It is important to note that there are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.  There are select sections Segment E that will be slightly depressed (or below grade). It is important to note that the right-of-way width needed for a freeway would not differ significantly regardless if the freeway was above, below, or at-grade. Above and below grade freeways are also more

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>expensive to construct as well as TxDOT is being asked by cities to remove existing elevated freeways in several locations across the state.</p> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
2007	3/15/2023	Susan Holdrich	Email	<p>As a homeowner, in the Ridgecrest neighborhood, and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Susan Holdrich</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
2008	2/27/2023	Susan Ligons	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, NO to Segment A YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT of the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Susan Ligons</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
2009	4/20/2023	Susan M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B!</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2010	3/22/2023	Susan Platt	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing in opposition to segment C on the Blue and Brown alternatives of the 380 Bypass routes. I get honey from farmers whose business will be disrupted with the route passing through their properties.</p> <p>Segment C will severely damage one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County and will eliminate a large area of suitable habitat for endangered and threatened species. Segment D on the purple and gold routes would appear to displace fewer homes.</p> <p><a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/0135-02-065%20etc_US380_Roll%20Plot%201.15.2021.pdf">http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/0135-02-065%20etc_US380_Roll%20Plot%201.15.2021.pdf</a></p> <p>Sincerely, Susan Platt</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>
2011	4/20/2023	Susan R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Strongly oppose segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2012	3/16/2023	Susan Spoonemore	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2013	3/9/2023	Susanne Cardona	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Susanne Cardona</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2014	2/6/2023	Susie Miles	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2015	2/18/2023	Susie Miles	Online	It saddens me that for 4 million dollars you are willing to disrupted so may lives. We did not buy land in the country to have it taken away by TXDOT because they failed to plan ahead for population growth. People choice to live where they live, they chose to work where they work, now live with your choices. During COVID there was no traffic... most of us live and work on our property or are retired we don't need an 8-lane highway. I'm not sure why the sudden change after two years? I'm unclear about 4-lanes going into 8-lanes and back into 6 lanes is going to help...sounds like you have created 2 new problems. I'm not sure why your worried about 100-year flood plain... the water will still come. It is so obvious that segment D is the better choose for all the people.	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion. TxDOT has developed a continuous traffic model through the corridor to assess traffic now and in the year 2050. This project was designed to satisfy expected traffic demand in the year 2050.</p>
2016	4/20/2023	Susie Pepas	Email	<p>To whom it may concern: after reviewing the following body of work that our amazing team of residents have put together to address our concerns about the path that TxDot is taking on the 380 bypass, I felt I needed to echo all of these concerns. I love our unique environment and am thriving in its community involvement. I am an avid walker, biker and group exercise facilitator for our residents and am concerned about our safety, health, and future with the proposed decision. I am more that astonished by the lack of fiscal responsibility. Please reconsider these decisions.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i>
2017	4/20/2023	Suzanne G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Unable to understand reason Segment A since it will cost \$100 Million more than B.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2018	3/8/2023	Suzette Lippa	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. In addition, a car wash is being built at the corner of Ridge and University Drive (380) which will also add to the congestion. The enterprise will be adjacent to a pre school and elementary school. On the opposite side of the corner of Ridge and 380, the CVS at 6161 University Drive is scheduled to close in April, taking away a vital medical resource for the neighborhood. When I moved from NYC in 2015, I knew that retail and residential building would increase here, but did not anticipate the chaos that the building of the Segment A would bring to the lifestyle in this part of Stonebridge Ranch.</p> <p>Suzette Lippa 6508 Grand Bay Court McKinney Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>As a part of this project, future developments were closely tracked by TxDOT and discussed with the City of McKinney and Town of Prosper as well as developers. Appendix S of the DEIS details indirect and cumulative effects, which includes details of the future development plans considered by TxDOT. A development heat map can be found at the Public Hearing website as well.</p> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p>
2019	4/20/2023	Suzette M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>Option A is far more expensive, far more environmentally and economically damaging than option B and will create an undue hardship via noise, air pollution and accessibility on the residents of Tucker Hill, all of whom have front porches</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p>
2020	2/22/2023	Suzette McKee	Online	<p>I oppose the selected option as a resident of Tucker Hill based on the excessively higher total project cost, significantly greater environmental and socioeconomic impacts. This is a nonstarter and the outer loop is sufficient to care for the through traffic. 380 should be left alone for local traffic as is. There is absolutely no reason to have chosen this option other than politics and greed. I will not tolerate this as an option. It's insane. I am a taxpayer.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2021	4/20/2023	Suzette McKee	Voicemail	<p>Hello my name is Suzette McKee, S-U-Z-E-T-T-E last name McKee, M-C-(Capital K)-E-E. My address is 2720 Majestic Avenue, McKinney Texas, 75071 and my phone number is 214-536-0400. My email address is [REDACTED] all one word [REDACTED]. I have some questions that I need answers to about the proposed segment A um in front of Tucker hill community, and the recent shift in the North-South line of the proposed segment A right next to tucker hill's community and along side it. Um for us to have our neighborhood completely surrounded is a health risk to myself and my husband. Tucker Hill has only has one entrance in and out. If there needed to be emergency vehicles to come and get us, he has diabetes, I have um asthma, severe asthma. How would those vehicles be able to reach us? And especially given the 90 degree turn and the very likely traffic pile up that would happen most of the time in front of our neighborhood. How is that going to be mitigated? Why did txdot choose to do such a thing when there was an alternative which was segment B, that was so much more attractive from a financial, environmental, and um impact to residents standpoint, current residents, people living here now? I needed to know why txdot did not choose a more economically, far more inexpensive option to the tune of at least 150 million dollars less expensive. How is txdot justifying that given the increased cost and the increased environmental impact? I have a right to quiet enjoyment of my...</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Some of TxDOT's top considerations in choosing Segment A over Segment B, because Segment A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Displaces fewer homes in comparison to Segment B</li> <li>-Results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes</li> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2022	4/20/2023	Suzette McKee	Email (2)	<p>Dear Ms. Clemens, This letter contains questions to which I seek answers and expresses how this project will personally impact my and my husband's quality of life. As a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
2023	4/20/2023	Suzette McKee	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres, I am writing to point out the reasons why Segment A as an option for the 380 bypass should be rejected outright. I also seek some answers to a few questions. I am a resident of the Tucker Hill subdivision, a uniquely charming neighborhood which would be most severely impacted by Segment A. However, even if I didn't live in this neighborhood, I would be strongly opposed to pursuing the route defined by Segment A. Here are the fact based economic, engineering/safety and environmental reasons, and some very important other reasons why Segment A should be rejected and TXDOT should proceed with either Segment B or use the outer loop to bypass business 380. Please tell me why all these facts that overwhelmingly show that Segment B is the better option did not result in that as the preferred option?</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
2024	4/20/2023	Suzy S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A !!! YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2025	3/11/2023	Suzy Sumrall	Email	<p>NO to Segment A As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Suzy Sumrall</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2026	4/20/2023	Sydney S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2027	4/20/2023	Sylvia W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2028	3/7/2023	T and C Fredricks	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2029	2/25/2023	T S	Online	I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons: 1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced. 2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D. 3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D. 4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0. 5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D. 6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. 7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2030	2/25/2023	Tama Montgomery	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Segment A will be less than 1/2 mile from my home, seriously increasing the traffic noise, not to mention the construction noise all day long for years while this is being built. Like many now, I work from home so this will impact my ability to conduct meetings and perform my job, potentially risking my livelihood. I'm also very concerned about the high risk Hazardous Materials that will be disturbed only 1 mile from my home. Stonebridge, located directly behind my back fence will become a main feeder to the highway entrance just up the street, ruining my peace and quiet enjoyment in my home, and backyard, not to mention dropping my property value. I would have never bought here if I knew I was going to be so close to a major highway! If this project is approved I will have to move again and as a single senior person that is no small task. Please consider alternatives to this proposal.</p> <p>Thank you Tama Montgomery</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT is proposing the following mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative identified in the draft EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-building sound barriers (noise walls) that do not exist today,</li> <li>-depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers, and</li> <li>-providing local street crossings over the depressed section to provide connectivity between neighborhoods.</li> </ul> <p>The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>Regarding the high risk hazardous materials site one mile from your home, refer to Appendix Q of the DEIS, specifically page 40 at the following website <a href="https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPENDIX%20Q%20-%20Hazardous%20Materials_0.pdf">https://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/sites/default/files/docs/APPENDIX%20Q%20-%20Hazardous%20Materials_0.pdf</a>. It details the proposed next steps for TxDOT to take to continue its evaluation of potentially impacted hazardous materials sites.</p>
2031	3/16/2023	Tamas Szabo	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2032	2/22/2023	Tami Johnston	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>I am writing in support of the Proposed Route A-E-C (The Blue Alternative) that was presented at the public meeting held on Thursday, February 16, 2023. I agree with TXDOT's findings specifically regarding Segment A. Segment A would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displace fewer homes in comparison to Segment B;</li> <li>• Result in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes in Ladera and Malabar Hills;</li> <li>• Avoid displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road;</li> <li>• Utilize more of the existing US 380 alignment through Prosper; and</li> <li>• Avoid impacting ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, a very important and highly-valued provider of services to Veterans and children with disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you so much for your work on this 380 project. Sincerely, Tami Johnston</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
2033	4/20/2023	Tamira S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Strongly SUPPORT Segment B. OPOSE Segment A!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2034	3/15/2023	Tammy Pennington	Email (2)	<p>Dear Mr. Endres,</p> <p>Please, please for the love of all that is good... keep alignment A or widen 380 to alleviate congestion on HWY 380. Please do not punish Prosper for McKinney's mistake of not planning for future growth. I hate to hear of any neighborhoods being harmed or destroyed by a bypass. I think the most kind option is widening 380. Alignment A is the second least harmful option if a bypass is mandatory. I am saddened by what seems to be little regard for neighborhoods that did not build on a highway being harmed or destroyed. Peoples homes are their sanctuary. Be kind to the homeowners and the wetlands. A bypass doesn't really align with the Nature part of McKinney's Unique by Nature motto. Not to mention the Mayor being a developer seems like a conflict of interest when it comes to what is in the best interest of it's citizens. Prosper has planned for widening of 380.. please don't punish us. Blessings.... I know this has been a challenge.</p> <p>Sincerely, Tammy Pennington Prosper Resident</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.</p> <p>None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2035	3/28/2023	Tania and Peter Chevalier	Email	Hello, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thanks, Tania and Peter	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2036	4/20/2023	Tanza S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	My vote for the US 380 Proposed Route. NO TO SEGMENTA, YES TO SEGMENT B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2037	4/20/2023	Tara C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Strongly oppose Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2038	3/16/2023	Tara Khedouri	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2039	3/15/2023	Tara Lenney	Online	380 Bypass Comments Construction Phase Traffic: Regarding Segment A vs. Segment B, the comparison used for the recommendation is lacking because it fails to address the impact to traffic on US 380 during the period of construction, which based on the fly through video most recently shared, will be substantial. Segment B could be built from the NE to the SW, with the it-in to the current 380 taking place during the final stage of construction, which would allow traffic to flow normally for the majority of the construction project. Contrast that with Segment A, which impacts a much larger extent of the existing road, creating a substantial impact to road traffic during the construction phase. Since the main project objective, as we have been told, is to improve traffic on 380, the feasibility comparison cannot be complete without comparing the impact of the project's execution on the end it pursues. The absence of this comparison on the draft EIS is substantial grounds to revisit the	Your comment is noted. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.  Based on our research of Collin County Appraisal District records, Property 2689146 is owned by SLC McKinney Partners LP C/O Southern Land Company. There is no mention of Collin County ownership or use. The majority of this property is outside of the proposed ROW, so direct impacts would be limited. Across this property, the Blue Alternative would be constructed on bridge, elevated over the floodplain, wetland features, and



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>decision.                      Wildlife habitat:                      Property 2689146 is a county-designated wildlife habitat with an active management plan. The area is home to a substantial population of coyotes, active songbirds, waterfowl, deer, bobcats, and beavers. The robust beaver population creates a natural wetland that serves as a habitat unique to the area in that it is accessible to nature enthusiasts and large enough to support the numerous species identified above. The wetland ecosystem created naturally in this area is an important flood control measure. The EIS is performed in the absence of assessing the net impact on watershed due to construction on the Wilson Creek corridor to the SE of the proposed project. Reducing the wetland area in the proposed development region will put additional strain on the downstream areas of Tucker Hill that are also increasingly narrowed and hardened with concrete. AN updated holistic floodplain analysis must be undertaken to ascertain the feasibility of safely construction this project, given development outside of its boundaries.                      Tara Lenney</p>	<p>Wilson Creek. During the development of alignments, TxDOT evaluated the property to identify habitats, possible protected species, and water features. Because no direct impacts would occur to these features outside of the proposed ROW, no additional study was required. The evaluation of cumulative effects - the effects of this US 380 project in combination with current and reasonably foreseeable future actions – is included in Section 3.16 of the DEIS. Additional hydraulic modeling may be conducted during final design to refine the placement of bridge piers and further minimize impacts to the Wilson Creek floodplain.</p>
2040	2/6/2023	Tara Royal Equestrian	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
2041	4/20/2023	Tara W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2042	2/6/2023	Tarik Algam	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
2043	4/20/2023	Tauri O	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The value of my home and my peace will be greatly diminished if the 380 bypass moves forward with plan A. I do not have the wherewithal to relocate. This will be devastating.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2044	3/13/2023	Ted and Jill Kopinski	Email	<p>We live on Grassmere Lane and have for almost 6 years. We fell in love with this neighborhood at first sight due to the lovely trees and beautiful craftsman homes. People from all over come year round to take wedding and prom/dance pictures and often have cars stop to take pictures and leave nice notes regarding looking at Christmas lights etc. Once we had a man propose in our front yard because he wanted pretty pictures. Although we have been to meetings, submitted letters and followed the progress of the 380 expansion, we are now hearing terrible things. We were encouraged when option B was being considered yet that was squashed even though it would cost less which seems crazy. We then came to terms and tried to look at the bright side of option A when we heard it would be below ground level. Now we have learned that it will raise into the sky we are told anywhere from 900-1700 feet from our backyard. This week we went and bought a new tree trying to see if that would cover the view of this monstrosity from our family room windows even though it would not help with noise levels. If this doesn't help we will be forced to sell at what I am sure will be a decreased value from before. It does seem as if this neighborhood is being singled out and discriminated against or sold out as it literally wraps around us on more than one side. As I drive the nearby area there is so much undeveloped land this crunch seems unnecessary. I have also heard that trees and sound barriers will not be provided. We continue to ask for option B to be considered. If that is no longer an option, I would ask that you consider keeping the road below level as it wraps the neighborhood until it has passed the last home to the north before it ascends. I would also ask for plenty of large trees on both sides of Tucker hill being affected as well as a sound barrier wall of some sort. I can't imagine our community pool will be very relaxing as we hear the highway noise. We are obviously doing something wrong here since a sound barrier is being provided for the other side of the highway only. Thank you for your consideration, Ted and Jill Kopinski Sent from Outlook</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The freeway mainlanes remained depressed or below grade approximately 30 feet at Grassmere Lane.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. Vegetation such as trees, shrubs and grasses, though very natural and attractive in appearance, offer little reduction in noise levels. Therefore, it is not considered part of the project. However, for beautification purposes, TxDOT does offer green ribbon programs that cities can apply for during future phases of the project.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>
2045	4/20/2023	Terence M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2046	4/20/2023	Teresa H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to Segment B - NO to segment A regarding Hwy 380 -Segment A is a poor choice - do not support for our city or my neighborhood.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2047	2/24/2023	Teresa M. Gahan	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Teresa M. Gahan	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2048	3/14/2023	Teri Tallman	Email	Mr. Endres, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX. I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Teri Tallman	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2049	3/7/2023	Terri Belanger	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2050	4/20/2023	Terrie R	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2051	2/25/2023	Terrie Rice	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Terrie Rice	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2052	4/20/2023	Terry and Kathy Stephenson	Email	<p>Mr Endres, I write you once again about my concerns regarding the Segment A impacts on Tucker Hill, one of McKinney's premier neighborhoods. I'm sure by now you've gotten numerous emails from Tucker Hill Residents regarding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that Segment B impacts fewer homes</li> <li>• The fact that Segment B has less environmental impact than Segment A</li> <li>• The fact that Segment B is significantly financially less expensive than Segment A</li> </ul> <p>• TXDot's putting MainGait's concerns over the residents of Tucker Hill for whatever reason</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise pollution affecting Tucker Hill residents</li> <li>• Community impacts affecting Tucker Hill residents</li> <li>• Aesthetic impacts affecting Tucker Hill residents</li> <li>• TXDots inaccurate traffic analysis</li> <li>• Community cohesion</li> <li>• Construction air and noise pollution affecting Tucker Hill residents</li> <li>• Segment A's shift closer to Tucker Hill without notice</li> <li>• Alleged invalid comments submitted by Bill Darling impersonating Tucker Hill residents</li> </ul> <p>So, since you've probably gotten several comments regarding the above, I would just like to tell you that my wife and I are elderly and each have chronic health issues and our concerns are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The apparent lack of studies regarding air quality. The quality of air we breathe is very important to our overall health. I fear that the construction while building Segment A and the ongoing air pollution after construction will be detrimental to our overall health.</li> <li>• The apparent lack of studies regarding noise pollution. Proper sleep and rest is important to us and I fear that the construction noise and the bypass traffic noise will be detrimental to our overall health.</li> <li>• I really don't understand the air and sound quality measures used. Can you explain them to me in layman's terms? Can you explain to me where the monitors were located in Tucker Hill for the studies?</li> <li>• Emergency response time during the constructing period. How will that be addressed?</li> <li>• What will happen to the overflow parking at Harvard Park when you take part of their parking lot? Will that overflow into Tucker Hill?</li> <li>• Please explain to me why TXDot put MainGait's concerns over the residents of Tucker Hill...</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for listening to my concerns. I look forward to your responses and pray that you will reconsider and NOT build the Segment A bypass. Terry &amp; Kathy Stephenson 7404 Ardmore Street McKinney, TX 75071</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the main lanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods is anticipated to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers compared to not depressing the freeway. Details of the traffic noise analysis and location of the noise receivers can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS. The receiver locations are on page 76.</p> <p>The same criteria were used to compare all segments. Specific weights were not applied to evaluation criteria. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. One of the many reasons that TxDOT evaluated the project by end-to-end alternatives and by segment is because there are notable differences in the three focus areas. For example, Focus Area 1, which includes Segments A and B, is expected to have much more future development particularly residential which will likely be built by the time TxDOT is able to construct this project.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>The current design shows that TxDOT would likely need to acquire the land where the last row of parking is for the Harvard Park parking lot. TxDOT does not anticipate that additional right-of-way beyond what is described in the DEIS will be needed for the project. If the property owner chooses to reconfigure parking due to the TxDOT ROW acquisition, they would have to do so on their own property. During the TxDOT ROW acquisition process, TxDOT hires a third party to appraise to and assess any potential damage and if the building can still operate with its original purpose.</p> <p>The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT. Under "NEPA Assignment", TxDOT adheres to FHWA policies in accordance with the CEQ's NEPA Implementing Regulations. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the DEIS, TxDOT assessed the direct impacts of the project such as clearing vegetation, placing fill material within wetlands, displacing homes or businesses, traffic noise, etc. and the potential for the alternatives considered to induce changes in land use and growth within the Study Area. TxDOT also addressed any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, the measures considered to minimize harm and to mitigate adverse effects, where applicable; and the steps taken during the study to comply with applicable state and federal environmental laws.</p>
2053	4/20/2023	Terry B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment a yes to segment b 380 proposed route	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2054	3/7/2023	Terry Stephenson	Email	<p>Stephen, I am a resident of Tucker Hill. I have voiced my concerns with you prior to Option A being the "preferred option" for TxDot. I'm trying to understand why Option A was "preferred" over Option B. I suppose it's politics. Maybe and airport? Option A is less expensive and less disruptive for homes and businesses. Is it better to spend more money (\$200 million?), destroy home values and uproot existing businesses rather than move ManeGait horses to a different location? What an unnecessary tax burden to the residents of McKinney.</p> <p>Also, why is Billingsly suddenly clearing land (since the announcement of Option A being preferred) close to the new Ridge Road extension to build future apartments, therefore pushing the bypass closer to Tucker Hill and destroying existing home values and quality of life in one of the premier neighborhoods in McKinney? That doesn't seem right! If Option A is a go forward, how will you address noise pollution and air pollution for Tucker Hill and Stonebridge residents? How will Tucker Hill residents get in and out of the neighborhood? Where's the promised Stonebridge extension and Tucker Hill access to it? Is that politics as well?</p> <p>With an Outer Loop being constructed at this very time, why build a bypass or widen 380 at all? I don't recall any bypasses to 635, 190 or 121?</p> <p>Regarding the widening of 380 from the Option A bypass- how will you address the bottlenecks that will surely happen going from 12 lanes back down to 6 lanes both eastbound and westbound? Why widen 380 for just 2-3 miles creating those future bottlenecks? Seems like it'll be worse than what exists today. If I'm missing something here, please feel free to reply back to me and maybe that will help me understand the logic that went in to these, to me, idiotic decisions.</p> <p>Terry Stephenson Sent from Mail for Windows</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 -- 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>TxDOT has found that if we do nothing, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future, even if all the planned roadways in Collin County including the Outer Loop, are constructed. Therefore, a US 380 freeway is needed to relieve congestion.</p> <p>In addition to this US 380 EIS project, TxDOT is currently working to complete schematic design and environmental review studies for US 380 through Collin and Denton counties. Information on all of these projects can be found via <a href="http://www.Drive380.com">www.Drive380.com</a>.</p>
2055	3/7/2023	Terry Stephenson	Online	<p>I am a resident of Tucker Hill and have voiced my concerns of Option A previously with Steven Andres. Option A is less expensive and less disruptive for existing homes and businesses. Is it smarter to spend more money, destroy home values and uproot existing businesses rather than address moving Maingate horses? Also, why let Billingsly clear land close to Ridge Road to build future apartments, therefore squeezing the bypass closer to Tucker Hill destroying existing home values and quality of life in one of the premier neighborhoods in McKinney? If Option A is a go forward, how will you address noise pollution, air pollution and access for Tucker Hill residents to get in and out of the neighborhood? With an Outer Loop being constructed, why build a bypass? To my knowledge, there are no bypasses to 635, 190 or 121. How will you address the future bottlenecks on 380 going from 12 lanes to 6 lanes both east and west? Why widen 380 for just 2-3 miles creating those bottlenecks?</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. A detailed technical report on the traffic noise analysis that was conducted can be found in Appendix R of the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>TxDOT has found that if we do nothing, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future, even if all the planned roadways in Collin County including the Outer Loop, are constructed. Therefore, a US 380 freeway is needed to relieve congestion.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads. In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>In addition to this US 380 EIS project, TxDOT is currently working to complete schematic design and environmental review studies for US 380 through Collin and Denton counties. Information on all of these projects can be found via <a href="http://www.Drive380.com">www.Drive380.com</a>.</p>
2056	3/13/2023	Terry Stephenson	Email	<p>I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. Terry Stephenson</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
2057	4/1/2023	Terry Stephenson	Email	<p>Mr. Endres, I am writing to request an additional extension of time to submit comments for the EIS as our lives, our homes, our health, and our safety will be potentially impacted daily by the actions of TxDOT. Our neighborhood leaders were waiting for a meeting with TxDOT engineers and experts to clarify some of our outstanding questions to help with our comments and after a month of waiting were told by TxDOT the meeting would no longer be an option. This has left us trying to sort out our study-related questions and hundreds of pages of analysis on our own over the past ten days. We have an outstanding list of questions regarding the noise and air pollution studies, mitigation, community impacts, traffic data, and the overall process. The city of McKinney has agreed to meet with our neighborhood leaders to help with our mitigation concerns, but that critical meeting, in order for us to submit proper comments, is pending a date that will likely not occur until after April 5. Our comments over the past 7 years have largely been shaped by what we learn from the TxDOT engineers and experts. According to the NEPA process, we know that once the comments have been collected, those comments are what help to shape the next steps of the FEIS and ROD. While a meeting with TxDOT would still be our preference, if we are left to continue to sort this out independently, we need more time. We were only given notice that our questions would not be answered on March 20, 2023. As the regulation allows for a longer comment period if deemed necessary to ensure the public and other</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>stakeholders have sufficient time to review and provide meaningful input on complex or contentious projects, I hope we as homeowners and taxpayers can be afforded this patience and grace as we aim to learn more, respond thoughtfully, and protect our families and communities. Thank you, Terry Stephenson</p>	
2058	2/6/2023	Terry/ Kimberlee Keel	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3                      1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives                      Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)                      2. Why do you support Segment D?                      I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:                      - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives                      - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets                      - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
2059	2/6/2023	Terry/Lori Crowder	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives</li> <li>Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> </ol> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.  Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.
2060	3/16/2023	Teshia Bilecki-Blanton	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2061	1/25/2023	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)		Re: Response to Request for TCEQ Environmental Review The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) received a request from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) regarding the following project: US 380, From Coit Road to FM 1827, Collin County (CSJs: 0135-02-065, 0135-03-053, 0135-15-002) In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between TxDOT and TCEQ addressing environmental reviews, which is codified in Chapter 43, Subchapter I of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) and 30 TAC § 7.119, TCEQ is responding to your request for review by providing the below comments. We are in support of the project. The environmental assessment addresses issues related to surface and groundwater quality. TxDOT will still need to follow all other applicable laws related to this project, including applying for applicable permits. If you have any questions, please contact the agency NEPA coordinator at (512) 239-0010 or [REDACTED]	Your comment is noted.
2062	2/27/2023	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Email	Recommendations from TPWD are listed in the following 5 comments. The letter in its entirety is included on in Section D of the Public Hearing Summary. Previous Coordination Comments 1. Please review previous TPWD correspondence in Appendix E of the DEIS and consider the recommendations provided, as they remain applicable to the project as currently proposed. TPWD also recommends including this letter in Appendix E for Agency Coordination. 2. As indicated in TPWD's November 23, 2020, scoping letter, TPWD recommended utilizing existing roadways to minimize impacts to floodplains, streams, wetlands, wildlife and aquatic habitat, as well as, reducing habitat fragmentation from new location roads. Further, TPWD advised against and discouraged the selection of Segments C and D, as both eastern segments would impact the East Fork Trinity River, and TPWD also noted that TxDOT should consider Segment D rather than Segment C.	1. TxDOT has reviewed the previous coordination correspondence. TxDOT's responses remain applicable. This DEIS response letter will be included in the FEIS.  2. Natural resource impacts were considered in the alternatives evaluation process; however, impacts to other resources were also considered, such as those comprising the human environment. The selection of the preferred alternative (blue alternative) was made based on consideration of a variety of factors, as detailed in the DEIS Figure 2-15 Alternatives Comparison Matrix. The proposed project design avoided and minimized impacts to natural resources as much as practicable, though the use of bridging and other measures.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>The Preferred Alternative has high impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, and grassland habitat that are valuable to fish and wildlife species. These sensitive areas should be protected to the maximum extent possible. TPWD recommends the consideration of additional modifications to the road alignment of the Preferred Alternative's eastern segment (Blue Alternative) to further minimize natural resource impacts.</p>	
2063	2/27/2023	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Email	<p>Comments on the DEIS                      Recommendation 1: TPWD notes that a newer version of TxDOT's Form "Documentation of Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Best Management Practices" (TPWD BMP Form in DEIS) with an effective date of April 2022 can be accessed on TxDOT's Natural Resources Toolkit Website (see link: 300-04-frm.docx (live.com)). TPWD recommends accessing the newer version of the TPWD BMP form to document the BMP for the project and updating the DEIS.                      Recommendation 2: TPWD recommends that the full language of all individual BMP within a category be added to the TPWD BMP Form in the DEIS dated on January 21, 2022 (pages 79-81) in Appendix O and updating the DEIS. TPWD understands that this list of project commitments made be revised at a later date if a change arises during the period between the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and construction phase. The TPWD BMP form is the key document of the DEIS for TxDOT to describe all proposed measures to avoid and minimize impacts to wildlife and fish species and their habitats prior to, during, and after construction for the project. A full description of the proposed measures provides a clear record of commitments to enable the public and other local, state, and federal agencies to understand how TxDOT plans to avoid and minimize impacts to natural resources from this project. It is important to further clarify and address these measures that will be taken by TxDOT to reduce environmental impacts in the DEIS.</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: TxDOT will update the Best Management Practices (BMP) Form.                       Recommendation 2: The updated BMP Form will include the full BMP language and be included in FEIS where applicable.</p>
2064	2/27/2023	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Email	<p>Impacts to Veg/Wildlife Habitat                      TPWD recommends using site planning and construction techniques to avoid or minimize disturbance to native vegetation and preserve existing native trees, shrubs, grasses and forbs, and aquatic and wetland systems. Locally adapted native species should be used in landscaping and revegetation for vegetation impacted by the project to benefit wildlife. Also, where possible, clearing of understory vegetation should be minimized because such vegetation provides habitat to many different species of wildlife. Natural buffers contiguous to any stream or wetland should remain undisturbed to preserve wildlife cover, food sources, and travel corridors if possible.</p>	<p>TxDOT has committed implementation of the Vegetation BMP and the Invasive Species BMP (see below). In addition, the DEIS states in section 3.11.1: "Following construction, landscaping, or seeding of the proposed ROW may occur in accordance with EO 13122 (Invasive Species) and under the guidance of TxDOT's Roadside Vegetation Management Manual and Landscape and Aesthetics Design Manual (see Section 3.11.3) and the Executive Memorandum on Environmentally and Economically Beneficial Landscaping (further described in Section 3.11.4)." In addition, Section 3.11.2, p. 3-154, states the following (for the Purple Alternative): Impacts to fish and wildlife would be minimized through initial project design considerations, avoidance and minimization of vegetation removal and stream channel disturbance, and implementation of stormwater and TPWD beneficial management practices TPWD (BMPs). TPWD BMPs are identified in the TPWD BMP form provided in Appendix O and are listed below. BMPs would be implemented because of potential impacts to state-listed species and SGCN. Construction activities would disturb only those</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>areas necessary to construct the proposed project, including minimizing disturbance to important microhabitats (e.g., snags, brush piles), if present. The removal of native vegetation would be avoided to the greatest extent practicable and seeding mixes and planting would be installed to restore cleared areas and minimize colonization by invasive species. Section 3.11.2, p. 3-155, states the following specifically for the Blue (Preferred) Alternative: Impacts to fish and wildlife would be minimized through initial project design considerations, avoidance and minimization of vegetation removal and stream channel disturbance, and implementation of stormwater and TPWD BMPs as described under the Purple Alternative. These BMPs are identified in the TPWD BMP form provided in Appendix O.</p>
2065	2/27/2023	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Email	<p>Water Resources  TPWD appreciates that TxDOT will incorporate the use of bridges and elevated road sections in the project design to span streams and wetlands. TPWD continues to recommend the selection of the alignment with the least impact to streams and wetlands for the project. Care should be taken to avoid multiple crossings of rivers and creeks and therefore removing large sections of riparian habitat. River and creek crossings should be located in previously disturbed areas and in areas where vegetation removal or disturbance can be avoided or minimized to prevent further fragmentation of the riparian corridors associated with these waterways.</p>	<p>Natural resource impacts were considered in the alternatives evaluation process; however, impacts to other resources were also considered, such as those comprising the human environment. The selection of the preferred alternative (blue alternative) was made based on consideration of a variety of factors, as detailed in the DEIS Figure 2-15 Alternatives Comparison Matrix. The proposed project design avoided and minimized impacts to natural resources as much as practicable, though the use of bridging and other measures. USACE permits would be obtained and mitigation would be implemented for impacted waterbodies as required under the Clean Water Act</p>
2066	2/27/2023	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Email	<p>Invasive Species – Recommendation: TPWD recommends implementing the following  Invasive Species BMP to prevent the inadvertent transfer of invasive plants and animals to and from the project site as outlined in TPWD’s Beneficial Management Practices: Avoiding, Minimizing, and Mitigating Impacts of Transportation Projects on State Natural Resources (Version September 17, 2021).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all work in water bodies designated as ‘infested’ or ‘positive’ for invasive zebra (<i>Dreissena polymorpha</i>) or quagga mussels (<i>Dreissena bugensis</i>) on <a href="http://texasinvasives.org/zebramussels/">http://texasinvasives.org/zebramussels/</a> as well as waters downstream of these lakes, all machinery, equipment, vessels, or vehicles coming in contact with such waters should be cleaned prior to leaving the site to remove any mud, plants, organisms, or debris, water drained (if applicable), and dried completely before use in another water body to prevent the potential spread of invasive mussels.</li> <li>• Care should be taken to prevent the spread of aquatic and terrestrial invasive plants during construction activities. Educate contractors on how to identify common invasive plants and the importance of proper equipment cleaning, transport, and disposal of invasive plants in a manner and location that prevents spread when invasive plants are removed during construction.</li> <li>• Care should be taken to avoid the spread of aquatic invasive plants such</li> </ul>	<p>TxDOT will add the Invasive Species Best Management Practices (BMP) to the BMP form. Language in the FEIS will be updated and the BMP Form will be included in the appropriate appendix.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>as giant Salvinia (<i>Salvinia molesta</i>), common salvinia (<i>Salvinia minima</i>), hydrilla (<i>Hydrilla verticillata</i>), water hyacinth (<i>Eichhornia spp.</i>), Eurasian watermilfoil (<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>), water lettuce (<i>Pistia stratiotes</i>), and alligatorweed (<i>Alternanthera philoxeroides</i>) from infested water bodies into areas not currently infested. All machinery, equipment, vessels, boat trailers, or vehicles coming in contact with waters containing aquatic invasive plant species should be cleaned prior to leaving the site to remove all aquatic plant material and dried completely before use on another water body to prevent the potential spread of invasive plants. Removed plants should be transported for disposal in a secure manner to prevent dispersal. Colonization by invasive plants should be actively prevented on disturbed sites in terrestrial habitats. Vegetation management should include removing or chemically treating invasive species as soon as practical while allowing the existing native plants to revegetate the disturbed areas; repeated removal or treatment efforts may be needed. Only native or non-invasive plants should be planted. Care should be taken to avoid mowing invasive giant reed (<i>Arundo donax</i>), which spreads by fragmentation, and to clean equipment if inadvertently mowed to prevent spread. If using hay bales for sediment control, use locally grown weed-free hay to prevent the spread of invasive species. Leave the hay bales in place and allow them to break down, as this acts as mulch assisting in revegetation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aquatic invasive species (e.g., tilapias (<i>Oreochromis spp.</i>, <i>Tilapia zillii</i>), suckermouth armored catfish (<i>Hypostomus plecostomus</i>, <i>Pterigoplichthys spp.</i>), Asian clams (<i>Corbicula fluminea</i>), zebra mussels (<i>Dreissena polymorpha</i>) or those not native to the subwatershed should not be relocated but rather should be dispatched. Invasive mussels attached to native mussels should be removed and destroyed or disposed prior to relocation of the native mussels. Prohibited aquatic invasive species, designated as such in 31 TAC §57.112, should be killed upon possession.</li> </ul>	
2067	3/8/2023	Tezarah Reagan	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Tezarah Reagan</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
2068	2/25/2023	TFC	Email	<p>As a homeowner very close to segment A and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2069	2/17/2023	Thais Swim	Online	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you, Thais Swim</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2070	2/6/2023	The RoseMary Barn	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>2. Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2071	4/3/2023	The Town Council of New Hope	Written Comment Form	<p>4/3/2023                      New Hope Town Council                      April 3, 2023                      TxDOT Dallas District                      ATTN: Stephen Endres, P.E.                      4777 East US Highway 80                      Mesquite, TX 75150                      Stephen.Endres@txdot.gov                      RE: FM 1827 and Future US 380 Interchange                      Per our April 2, 2022 letter, the Town Council is still in favor of the Segment D alignment. New Hope Road is a primary conduit providing access to E University drive, and as such, a conduit to Princeton, downtown McKinney, Sam Rayburn Tollway and Central Expressway (75) for southbound traffic for New Hope residents. In the proposals that we have viewed in the February 2023 public hearings, the direct connection between New Hope Road and E University Drive will be severed as presented in Inset G alternative design. Instead, westbound traffic from New Hope Road will need to travel northwest on the proposed US 380 bypass and then need to use a turn-around to return to access downtown McKinney, Sam Rayburn Tollway and Central Expressway (75). Alternatively, traffic would need to use FM 2933 and follow a similar path to access downtown McKinney, Sam Rayburn Tollway and Central Expressway (75). This will create an overwhelming burden on FM 2933 and does not provide a significantly better route than the New Hope Rd/proposed US 380 bypass route. Traffic bound for Princeton would also then naturally route through Tarvin Rd/CR 337. Tarvin/337 is a narrow county road and not county road and not constructed to be used as a main thoroughfare. This solution of severing the direct connection between New Hope Road and E University drive is therefore an unacceptable proposal. Please advise as to an alternative routing/solution that does not sever the New Hope Road / E University Drive connection. Respectfully,                      The Town Council of New Hope                      Collin County, Texas</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment D is noted. The purpose of the Alternative Inset G design was to not increase traffic on FM 1827. It was in response to early coordination efforts with Town of New Hope representatives who did not want additional traffic going through the Town of New Hope on FM 1827.</p> <p>TxDOT will continue to work with the Town of New Hope and consider any updated or future comments about the project.</p>
2072	3/16/2023	Thella James	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A                      March 16, 2023                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2073	4/20/2023	Therese H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A - Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2074	3/23/2023	Thomas Bald	Email (2)	I strongly oppose Segment C and support Segment D. There are too many environmental concerns with Segment C. Texas Parks and Wildlife prefers Segment D. I'm also concerned that many more residents, businesses and community services are affected by Segment C. Once again, I oppose Segment C!	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
2075	4/20/2023	Thomas G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A. Yes to Segment B, please.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2076	3/7/2023	Thomas George	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Best regards, Thomas George	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2077	4/20/2023	Thomas H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A. It is hard to understand why segment A would be picked over segment B given the added destruction and cost. By looking at a map of the two options it is obvious all traffic wanting to access segment E will be driving much further by using segment A instead of segment B wasting gasoline, diesel fuel, electricity and time for decades to come.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2078	4/20/2023	Thomas H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	The choice should be Segment B through Prosper, not Segment A through Mckinney. It will cost less and not damage as much existing properties in Mckinney.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2079	3/28/2023	Thomas L Titus	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden, destroy fewer businesses and homes. I would expect an office in our state government to not make decisions that cost the taxpayers more money. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Thomas L Titus	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2080	4/20/2023	Thomas M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Go with most cost efficient route. Don't acquiesce to special interests that end up costing tax payers more.	Your comment is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2081	3/8/2023	Thomas Mitchell	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thomas Mitchell	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2082	4/20/2023	Thomas S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	A is too disruptive to mckinney's current and planned development.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2083	4/20/2023	Thomas S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Option B is a much better decision financially. Option A will decimate the value of houses in Tucker Hill, and add an unreasonable amount of exhaust pollution and noise pollution. Unless McKinney is prepared to pay each homeowner in Tucker Hill for property value losses, and add walls to mitigate noise and exhaust pollution, Option A should be eliminated.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A and support of Segment B is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.
2084	3/7/2023	Thomas Vandebush	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Regards Thomas Vandebush 6100 Belle court McKinney Texas 75072 972-922-3533	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2085	4/20/2023	Thomas W	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2086	4/20/2023	Tiffani L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	It isn't logical to pick the more expensive route while displacing so many businesses that are valuable tax revenue that would help pay for the bypass. Why would you choose the route that costs more and causes the most disruption to businesses and residences.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2087	2/17/2023	Tiffany Hand	Online	I oppose route C, and prefer section D as the alternative. Our friends and family are going to lose their home and ranch. They have young children and will be homeless. These are people that have lived in McKinney for several decades or their whole lives and contribute tirelessly to our community. They host bible studies, provide therapeutic visits for children, especially those with special needs. We appreciate you seeking out our feedback and hope and pray that our voices are heard. Section D would potentially displace far less residents and businesses. I implore you to base your decision on the value that will be added to the entire McKinney community in the long run rather than the most base economical option.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.  All right-of-way acquisition would be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Brochures, including two booklets titled "The Purchase of Right of Way," and "Relocation Assistance," are available on the project website. These booklets contain detailed information to inform property owners of their rights and provide information about the TxDOT right-of-way acquisition process. Property owners are entitled to fair market value compensation and relocation assistance, among other services.
2088	2/16/2023	Tiffany Nayar	Online	For all the reasons txdot decided to keep the bypass out of prosper are the same reasons 380 should be kept on 380. Do not go back on your decision to expand 380 through McKinney. Prosper should not have to have 380 cut through areas such as Mane Gate, the new developing senior living area, and drastically alter areas around PISD schools and Foundations private academy. 380 needs to stay on 380!	Your comment is noted. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative. The freeway would stay along the existing US 380 through the Town of Prosper.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2089	2/27/2023	Tim and Melody Easterwood	Email	<p>Good afternoon, This email is written to ask you to please do your research and consider how the proposed Route C negatively affects so many areas. My sister has had her ranch (above address) for years and has poured her life and soul into this place. It is beautiful and important. So many homes, businesses and community resources will be negatively impacted if the proposed highway proceeds with the Route C plan. There are clearly other options that have way less impact on the community and the beauty of this area. Please do your job and do it well by considering your constituents and voting NO to the Route C plan. This is not just a highway....it is people's lives and future. Thank you for your consideration and I am praying that you make the right choice. Sincerely, Tim &amp; Melody Easterwood</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas Administrative Code. More information about the necessary steps to identify and address community impacts on a TxDOT project can be found at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/710-01-gui.pdf</a>. The project team analyzed the areas around Segments C and D through multiple in-person field visits where Right of Entry (ROE) was granted, use of aerial imagery/maps, and existing databases including Collin County Appraisal District listings.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p>
2090	3/15/2023	Tim Himes	Online	<p>Proposed Plan "A" is a horrible plan...wasted tax payers money plus disrupting over 350 homeowners needlessly. This was a last minute change based only on who was going to profit the most, not on the current homeowners or taxpayers in general.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
2091	2/26/2023	Tim Leeth	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you Tim Leeth 7708 Rockdale Road McKinney TX 75071 214-425-7656</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
2092	2/25/2023	Tim Siemers	Email	<p>Hi Stephen, As a homeowner in Stonebridge Ranch, McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and instead support Segment B proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Segment A would dramatically lower our home property values and destroy the peaceful environment we all currently enjoy. Thank you, Tim Siemers 414 Treeline Drive McKinney, TX 75072</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2093	4/20/2023	Tim Skowronski	Email	<p>Stephen, I hope you are well. I am a resident of the Tucker Hill community north of 380 just east of Stonebridge Road. I am writing because I am concerned. I am concerned about safety and quality of life. I am concerned about environmental impact and cost. I am concerned about the short and long term impacts of the project that seems to have many unanswered questions. I do not believe the best interest of McKinney, including our neighborhood, has been fully considered for the acceptance of Segment A in the 380 bypass project. Our neighborhood has pulled together a document that I implore you to spend time reviewing and responding to while considering this project. Thank you.</p> <p>Tim Skowronski 7204 Cheltenham Ave 313-598-9799</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p> <p><i>Attached letter and its response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
2094	3/30/2023	Tim Snow	Email	<p>Dear Texas Department of Transportation, McKinney, and Prosper, I am writing to express my concern about the proposed 380 Bypass highway project, specifically the portion that will span the cities of McKinney and Prosper known as route A and Route B. According to the TX DOT, the purpose of this project is to manage congestion, improve traffic flow, and enhance safety. However, it has come to my attention that there are two plans for the end of the highway, and it is painfully obvious to any reasonable person that Plan A is not the best option for the Texas tax payer and residence. Plan A would require the highway to go through just one city, at a higher expense to the tax payer, and would not bypass as much of the major roadway. This plan would force the road to run from north to south, which is not ideal for alleviating traffic from east to west. Plan B, on the other hand, is the most cost-effective plan as it would go mostly through McKinney and run through Plano for about a mile. Plan B would bypass highway 380, avoid cutting off the entire community of Tucker Hill from the city, and displace only an additional 3 residences, a horse farm, and "planned" communities, a minimal impact considering the scope of the project and future implication for efficiency and safety. It is concerning to hear that special interests in Prosper are putting pressure on the government to build the more expensive and inefficient highway, despite the fact that its residents will also benefit from the bypass. It is unethical for Prosper to insist that it does not bear any land annexation when its residents will enjoy traffic relief as well. Plan A reduces the efficacy of every major stated goal of the DOT . As taxpayers and residents, we must look at the long-term benefits and costs of each plan. Plan B is the best option as it is more cost-effective and better meets the need for bypassing highway 380, improving east-west traffic flow, and enhancing safety. We must consider the impact that the project will have on the community and the environment for decades to come. Therefore, I urge the Texas Department of Transportation, McKinney, and Prosper to build Plan B. Furthermore, I suggest that if the taxpayers of Prosper want to build a more expensive</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A, is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A also results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				roadway to their advantage, then their taxpayers should bear the expense. This is a fair and just approach that ensures that each city bears the cost of their respective projects. Thank you for considering my concerns. Sincerely, Timothy Snow	
2095	3/16/2023	Tim Thompson	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2096	3/29/2023	Timothy Montgomery	Email	Dear Mr. Enders, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Timothy Montgomery Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2097	4/20/2023	Timothy S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose Segment A as it will DESTROY OUR PEACEFUL COMMUNITY!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2098	2/28/2023	Todd Huthmaker	Email	Hi Stephen, If you are still considering input, my vote is NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B. As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Segment A would very negatively impact the area where I live. Thanks for your consideration. Todd Huthmaker	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2099	4/20/2023	Todd P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2100	3/7/2023	Todd Pegram	Email (2)	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Todd Pegram 865-399-9309	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2101	4/20/2023	Todd Z	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2102	2/25/2023	Tom and Carolyn Fredricks	Email	Comment: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Tom and Carolyn Fredricks Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2103	4/20/2023	Tom F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A yes to segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2104	3/8/2023	Tom Keenan	Online	Section E was decided before the population density of the Timber Creek, and Erwin farms development increased. Now both developments have section E, essentially running into their backyards. Residents can expect, pollution, noise, and property prices to drop. Even the fly through videos do not show the extent of these two developments. EPA doc: EPA-420-F-14-044 states many health issues living in proximity to freeways, including pulmonary issues in children. Move section E north, use land in Erwin Park. Environmental impact to people and their families needs to be addressed. Building larger roads, just attracts more traffic. There is almost no public transport in McKinney, no rail lines to Dallas . A frequent shuttle service to downtown McKinney would reduce traffic, and benefit business . Give companies who allow McKinney residents to work remote tax breaks, reduce commuter traffic. Zoning plans should include essential services like groceries stores, within apprx 5 miles.	Your comment and opposition of Segment E is noted. TxDOT has been in coordination with the City of McKinney regarding future development plans. All developments that have secured a building permit will be considered in a final noise analysis that will be conducted by TxDOT before the end of the project.  In regards to your comment about Erwin Park, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act stipulates that TxDOT cannot approve the use of land from publicly owned parks or recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges or public and private historic sites unless the following conditions apply: -There is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative to the use of that land; and the action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use; or -TxDOT determines that the use of the property will have a de minimis impact  According to Section 2.1.6 of the DEIS, transit as a standalone alternative would not satisfy the identified needs of this project.
2105	4/20/2023	Tom P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly urge TXDOT the following, No to Segment A. Yes to Segment B. It saves money and my taxpayer funds.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2106	2/17/2023	Tom Potter	Online	<p>Regarding "C" versus "D", either will be an absolute catastrophe' for all involved. Neither C nor D should exist at all! The two bypasses (McKinney and Princeton) should connect without rejoining the existing right of way. Creating the short segment between the bypasses is an active decision to build a nightmare of a bottleneck with little to have gained from doing so. Further once the bottleneck is created and inescapably accidents or issues occur in the short segment - there are absolutely no reasonable alternate routes so the effect will be severe. Granted there is no alternate route today, but after spending millions if not billions why not have an improvement as opposed to making it worse. The effect on me personally is farther East in the Princeton bypass (near CR 406) but whether it affects me directly or not - the idea of TWO bypasses when ONE WILL DO is not reasonable to my thinking.</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>
2107	2/19/2023	Tom Weslocky	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Endres                      I am writing to express my concern for the Highway 380 Bypass Route C option. It will be catastrophic. Not only would this option destroy many, many beloved homes and businesses, but human beings, livestock, and other domestic animals, not to mention the surrounding wildlife and beautiful nature that the community enjoys so much. There are historic hundred year old peach, pecan, and plum trees in this section. Hay is grown and cut here for rescue animals who live on this land. We live in a fast-paced world, and it is so wonderful to have an escape as close as McKinney to enjoy. Folks from all over north Texas enjoy what McKinney and the McKinney countryside has to offer. Route C will forever change this, and these communities will suffer, particularly in the areas of Route C containing sections 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, and 421. Many residents from McKinney and other surrounding communities enjoy the ranch life, and families, at-risk youth, and church ministries alike love to learn about nature, wildlife preservation, agriculture, biology, equine management, and more in these areas. Please consider Route D as an alternative to Route C. The environmental impact assessments have already been completed for Route D, which is no easy, quick, or cheap task. There are also substantially less homes and businesses which are affected through Route D. Six community recourses will be affected by Route C, whereas none will be affected by Route D. I certainly hope the right decision will be made, trusting that you are smart, good stewards of the trust and confidence that has been placed in you as representatives of the people, and that you care deeply about the community of McKinney and its surrounding areas. Thank you for your time and consideration. Remember - "C=CATASTROPHIC, D=DECENT." Sincerely,                      Tom Weslocky</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS,</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.
2108	4/20/2023	Tommy L	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2109	3/8/2023	Toni Jenkins	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from Mail for Windows	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2110	3/15/2023	Toni Portmann	Email	ON THE ISSUE OF 380 BYPASS ROUTE C & D; PLEASE OPPOSE ROUTE C 100% !!! Here is why: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• Destroy 71% more acres of forests and woodlands</li> <li>• Destroys 141% more acres of grassland and prairie</li> <li>• Disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• Eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.</li> <li>• Affects and displaces 383% more of homes ( 29 versus 6), 300% more businesses ( 6 versus 4)</li> <li>• Affects and displaces more community resources</li> <li>• Strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife</li> </ul> Please OPPOSE 380 BYPASS ROUTE C!	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.  Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>Here is why!                      toni portmann                      possibilitarian                      [REDACTED]                      mobile: 972.342.2482                      home: 6507 westgate drive • dallas, tx • 75254</p>	<p>River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2111	3/15/2023	Tonya Riggs	Email	<p>Good Morning Stephen, As a Realtor, I've had dozens of people ask my advice and thoughts in the bypass options. I've looked at several maps online and tried to zoom in to see the proximity to: Tucker Hill McKinney Whitley Place Prosper Timber Creek McKinney Auburn Hills McKinney Painted Tree McKinney Do you have a like to a map where you can really zoom in to see those above and even streets within those above? Would you be able to provide an approx ballpark date of construction start and completion would be appreciated. Thank you! Texas Real Estate Commission Information About Brokerage Services: 972-658-2588 Visit My Website! Check out client reviews! GRI, SRES, ABR, ePRO, Cert. Negotiations Expert +200M SOLD &amp; D Magazine's BEST-15 YEARS Ebby Halliday Realtors</p>	<p>An interactive map is available on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p> <p>The conceptual timeline shared at the Public Hearing indicates that a Record of Decision for the EIS is anticipated to be issued in the fall of 2023. The next phase of project development is final design, ROW acquisition, and utilities coordination. This phase is estimated to take 2-4 years, putting the Ready to Let date sometime in 2027. Currently this project is not fully funded. Phased construction can only begin once full project funding is identified and secured for US 380.</p> <p>This anticipated timeline is subject to change pending coordination, public involvement, technical analysis, and identification of funding.</p>
2112	4/20/2023	Toria C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>I adamantly oppose segment A. Yes for segment B. The bypass will be extremely close to our subdivision &amp; we're not in the position to move.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>
2113	3/28/2023	Town of Prosper	Email	<p>On behalf of Mayor Bristol for the Town of Prosper, please see the attached letter and supporting documents to be included in the public comments regarding the preferred alignment for the future expansion of U.S. Highway 380. Thank you.</p> <p><i>The full letter can be seen in Section D of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>TxDOT has treated all three parks (Rutherford Park, Wandering Creek Park, and Ladera Park) as Section 4(f) resources in our analysis. The omission of these three parks on the map in Appendix M was the result of an inadvertent clerical error and did not affect our analysis, as all three parks were discussed in Section 3.9 of the DEIS and shown on the map contained in the body of the DEIS at Figure 3-40. In the FEIS, Appendix M has been updated to show all three parks consistent with the map contained in the body of the FEIS.</p> <p>It is not necessary for TxDOT to make a determination regarding whether use of Wandering Creek Park and Ladera Park would or would not be in compliance with Section 4(f) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)'s implementing regulations at 23 CFR Part 744 because the preferred Blue Alternative does not use either of those parks. As explained in Section 3.9 of the FEIS, the Blue Alternative would require right-of-way from Rutherford Park; however, that would be the case with respect to any of the reasonable alternatives evaluated in the FEIS. TxDOT will evaluate Rutherford Park under Section 4(f).</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2114	4/5/2023	Town of Prosper Resolution	Email	<p>TOWN OF PROSPER, TEXAS RESOLUTION NO. 2023-27 A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUCIL OF THE TOWN OF PROSPER, TEXAS, SUPPORTING U.S. HIGHWAY 380 BEING A CONTROLLED ACCESS HIGHWAY WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE TOWN OF PROSPER, IN ACCORDANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION IN ITS DECEMBER 2022 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR U.S. HIGHWAY 380 FROM COIT ROAD TO FM 1827, AND JANUARY 2023 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR U.S. HIGHWAY 380 FROM TEEL PARKWAY TO LAKEWOOD DRIVE, AS MORE FULLY DESCRIBED HEREIN; ACKNOWLEDGING THE PREFERRED ALIGHMENT OF THE FUTURE EXPANSION OF U.S. HIGHWAY 380 WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE TOWN IS CONSISTENT WITH THE TOWN'S THOUROUGHFARE PLAN; REQUESTING THAT THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REFLECT THE ALIGHMENT OF U.S. HIGHWAY 380 WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE TOWN OF PROSPER AS RECOMMENDED; MAKING FINDINGS; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SUBMIT COMMENTS TO THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND/OR DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.</p> <p>WHEREAS, the Town Council of the Town of Prosper has consistently supported improving the U.S. Highway 380 corridor to improve mobility for the region; and WHEREAS, the Town Council of the Town of Prosper also has consistently supported U.S. Highway 380 being a controlled access highway within the corporate limits of the Town; and WHEREAS, the Texas Department of Transportation ("TxDOT") has determined its preferred alighment of U.S. Highway 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 - the Blue Preferred Alighment, as reflected in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement dated December 2022, with such location described and depicted in Exhibit A, attached hereto; and WHEREAS, TxDOT also has determined its preferred alignment of U.S. Highway 380 from Teel Parkway to Lakewood Drive, as reflected in the Draft Environmental Assessment dated January 2023, with such location described and depicted in Exhibit B, attached hereto; and WHEREAS, the Town Council agrees that TxDOT's preferred alignments of U.S. Highway 380 in the Town - the Blue Preferred Alignment for the Coit Road to FM 1827 project, and the preferred alignment for the Teel Parkway to Lakewood Drive project, as reflected in the December 2022 Draft Enviornmental Impact Statement and January 2023 Draft Environmental Assessment, respectively, are beneficial to the Town as well as its residents and businesses; and WHEREAS, the Town Council hereby desires to express its strong support of the preferred alignments of U.S. Highway 380 in the Town, as described and depicted in attached Exhibit A and Exhibit B; and WHEREAS, the Town Coouncil further requests that TxDOT's Final Environmental Impact Statement and Final Enviornmental Assessment reflect the alignment of U.S. Highway 380 within the corporate limits of the Town of Prosper as recommended and</p>	Town of Prosper support of the Preferred Alternative is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>referenced herein. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF PROSPER, TEXAS, THAT:</p> <p>SECTION 1 The findings set forth above are incorporated into the body of this Resolution as if fully set forth herein.</p> <p>SECTION 2 The Town Council of the Town of Prosper, Texas, hereby storngly supports U.S. Highway 380 being a controlled access highway within the corporate limits of the Town in accordance with TxDOT's preferred alignment of U.S. Highway 380 - the Blue Preferred Alignment for the Coit Road to FM 1827 project, and the preferred alignment for the Teel Parkway to Lakewood Drive project, as reflected in the Draft Enviornmental Impact Statment and Draft Environmental Assessment referenced in the Preamble to this Resolution.</p> <p>SECTION 3 The Mayor of the Town of Prosper is hereby authorized to submit comments to TxDOT regarding on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and/or Draft Enviornmental Assessment referenced in the Preamble to this Resolution.</p> <p>SECTION 4 The Town Council hereby directs Town staff to promptly forward a copy of this Resolution to the Texas Department of Transportation.</p> <p>SECTION 5 Any and all resolutions, rules, regulations, policies, or provisions in conflict with the provisions of this Resolution are hereby repealed and rescinded to the extent of any conflict herewith.</p> <p>SECTION 6 This Resolution shall be effective from and after its passage by the Town Council.</p> <p>DULY PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF PROSPER, TEXAS, ON THIS 28TH DAY OF MARCH, 2023. David F. Bristol, Mayor ATTEST: Michelle Lewis Sirianni, Town Secretary APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY: Terrence S. Welch, Town Attorney</p>	
2115	2/6/2023	TR Kno	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</li> <li>Why do you support Segment D?</li> </ol> <p>I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>by the community                      - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
2116	4/20/2023	Tracey P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2117	4/20/2023	Traci Holcomb	Email	<p>Stephen, I am a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer. I live in the sought after front porch community of Tucker Hill. It saddens me to think of what will become of our community if segment A is chosen over Segment B. Segment B is not only fiscally better but displaces fewer homes and businesses. I am seriously concerned about our access to the community when construction starts...as well as the access of first responders and school buses. What is being done to extend Stonebriar to provide another entrance and exit? What are you doing to combat the noise and air pollution? Please consider keeping the highway from encroaching any further west into Tucker Hill. We have worked hard to present a welcoming entrance and don't want a highway in our front yard. Please do what is fiscally sound and impacts the fewest residents of McKinney.</p> <p>Best Traci Holcomb Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads.</p> <p>In response to concerns from Tucker Hill residents, the roll plots for the Public Hearing showed that TxDOT added a connection over the freeway at Tremont Blvd. and the future US 380. This at-grade overpass over the depressed mainlanes will allow for left in and left out access to Tucker Hill. It also means that drivers will have a direct entrance to Tucker Hill instead of driving further to U-turn at another interchange.</p> <p>TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the NCTCOG's Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 -- 2026 TIP. TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43 % by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet.</p>
2118	3/9/2023	TRACK ID 288426/ Brian de la Houssaye	Online	<p>Case Subject      Roadway Project Issue ID                    288426 Description      Dear Governor Abbott, I am writing to ask you to investigate the decision process recently used by TXDOT to decide on Segment A versus                    Segment B for the proposed US380 Bypass. First and foremost, no one truly understands why it took TXDOT such a long time to decide on activity when 30 years ago it was evident DFW growth was northward and the ONLY potential east-west route to the far north was US380 because of Lake Louisville. After input from a number of parties</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>. An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. Any TxDOT environmental document, such as the one created for this study, must meet standards required by TxDOT policy to comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA compliance procedures and Title 43, Chapter 2 of the Texas</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>TXDOT decided on Section A, which means virtually the entire bypass will go through McKinney, including much of McKinney that is already developed. This means the citizens of McKinney will have to absorb millions of unbudgeted dollars for traffic, of which in excess of 90% originates and terminates elsewhere. Instead of having a small portion of the bypass go through undeveloped sections of Prosper, virtually all of it will go through developed sections of McKinney. By TXDOT's own admission Section A is more expensive, longer and constitutes a less timely commute time than Section B, which would run through largely undeveloped land in both Prosper and McKinney. The disparity is even greater when taking into account TXDOT used very aggressive estimates for POTENTIAL relocation of major utilities. A major note of exception listed by TXDOT is that Section B would have passed close to ManeGait, a therapeutic horse center for children run by the Darling family on property contiguous to their homestead. Section B would require some of the Darling's property so the Darlings made an issue, claiming the bypass would create a deteriorated atmosphere for children riding nearby. I grew up on horses. I rode everywhere. Often on roadways. Traffic noise is a constant of the modern world. I am certain the Darling family is unhappy with Section B, but does that justify destroying businesses with Section A so they can preserve the peacefulness of their homestead? Does the potential future development of Proper property justify the destruction of existing developed property in McKinney? Section A costs the taxpayers of McKinney and of Texas as a whole more than Section B. There is simply no justification for this decision unless there were factors opaque to the general public. Please reverse or investigate this decision.</p> <p>Date of Occurrence Complaint Location Notes Contact Brian de la Houssaye Issue Type Projects Case Type Complaint</p>	<p>Administrative Code.</p> <p>TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative, which is a combination of Segments A, E, and C, as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. The decision is informed by both a qualitative and quantitative analysis. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. Refer to Section 2.4 in the DEIS for an explanation of why the Blue Alternative was selected over the other Build Alternatives.</p> <p>For more information, please reference the Alternatives Analysis Matrix in the DEIS in Figure 2-15 on page 2-33. You may also view the Segment Analysis Matrix on the Public Hearing website at <a href="http://www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS">www.KeepItMovingDallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>
2119	4/20/2023	TraeAnn J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Segment B is a much better option!!!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
2120	3/28/2023	Travis Bryant	Email	<p>As a long time homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. We appreciate Main Gate - let's find them a place where they are not crowded out by businesses and subdivisions. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Travis Bryant</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2121	3/16/2023	Travis J Reinert	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Travis J Reinert	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2122	2/22/2023	Tricia Standish	Email	I, and many others, find it curious that the more logical alignment, being the one that runs through Prosper, and that crosses Custer Rd north of 380, was not chosen for the expansion. The original Alternative B. It is much cheaper, and impacts far fewer properties. I read that the City of McKinney offered to move the Mane Gait riding facility at no charge, but that offer was declined. The road would pass north of them, not through the stable. Stables are easily relocated. Houses are not. I hope that TxDOT will reconsider, and do the right thing. Please make the Prosper B alignment the chosen route. Not the blue alternative which will adversely impact Walnut Grove Estates and businesses, and Stonebridge Ranch etc. with massive noise pollution.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2123	2/23/2023	Tricia Standish	Email	In addition to my original comment, I should like to add that the present preferred alignment will cause massive drops in property values to the homes closest to 380 at Walnut Grove Estates. Not only that, the purchase of a replacement home for seniors would come with a massive hike in property taxes which are based on the value of any new property. AND for a home owner who happens to be single, divorced or widowed rather than married, the federal taxes on profits over \$500,000 is double than for a married couple. Since most of the affected residents along 380 bought years ago when 380 was a quiet two lane road, it will affect a single person, unmarried or widowed, twice as much as a couple, since a replacement residence would ( all things being equal) cost the same to purchase. Please go with the original alignment through Prosper, north of Mane Gait. In addition, I notice that section C that is being protested, is more expensive than D. Since the original Prosper alignment is cheaper than the preferred blue alignment, surely that savings could go towards switching C to D with no adverse affect on financing.	Your additional comment is noted. Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.
2124	4/20/2023	Trish A	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Oppose! Oppose! Oppose! Terrible idea!	Your comment is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2125	4/20/2023	Troy H	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to Segment A!!!	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2126	4/20/2023	Tyler J	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO to segment A. YES to segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2127	3/30/2023	Tyler Williamson	Email	<p>Oppose C and Support D                      Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>• C disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• C eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/ threatened species.</li> <li>• C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D).</li> <li>• C affects and displaces 383% more homes (29 vs. 6), 300% more businesses (16 vs. 4), and more community resources.</li> </ul> <p>Because of TXDOT's calculation methodology, there are double the number of homes impacted as any home 100 feet or more from the road is considered "not impacted." Respectfully,                      Tyler Williamson                      972-741-4618</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.
2128	1/17/2023	Unidentified	Online	If this were moved north to run along where FM1461 currently stands, literally all problems would be solved. People are willing to drive 3 minutes to get there. It's the obvious solution.	Your comment is noted. There would be similar impacts challenges in constructing a freeway along FM 1461 and anywhere north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.
2129	2/22/2023	Unknown	Online	We don't want this. You are destroying our beautiful community. Stay out!	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.
2130	2/16/2023	Unknown	Online	no to segment C!!!! Catastrophic, stupid, nonsensical. do the right thing	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
2131	2/17/2023	Unknown	Online	Please do not build this freeway. This is going to destroy all of the natural animal habitats behind our house. There does not need to be another highway built. We moved to McKinney because it's "about nature" but what you are doing is destroying McKinney's slogan. You are endangering the habitat of hawks, rabbits, skunks, etc etc etc. We do not want your highway!!!	<p>Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The project is needed because population growth within the central portion of Collin County has caused increases in current and forecasted traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827, leading to increased congestion, reduced mobility, and higher crash rates compared to other similar roadways in the region. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage congestion, improve east-west mobility, and improve safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.</p> <p>Even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2132	2/17/2023	Unknown	Online	I am opposed to segment c. It cuts thru our property next to our new house destroying our homestead. We were told the segment D was the route Tex DOT would use. Now they lie about a feasibility study rather than going with the initial assesment approved by Texas Parks and Wildlife and the people who live in the community. This segment will destroy a wildlife habitat and multiple homesteads. Please don't lgo with segment C	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted. TxDOT's Recommended Alignment, which included a conceptual Segment D section, was based on the data collected during the Feasibility Study. Throughout the subsequent NEPA process, TxDOT has gathered more detailed information, and will continue to work with stakeholders to gather information.
2133	2/17/2023	Unknown	Online	Segment C affects a much greater number of residents and has a major impact to one of the largest forested area in central Collin County. According to the TxDOT presentation, Segment A was selected due to its minimal impact to residences and future development. Segment D should be selected for the same reasons.	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>
2134	2/16/2023	Unknown	Paper form	No to Route C! Displaces too many Large Ranches. Go with Route D	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
2135	2/25/2023	Unknown	Online	380 needs to stay on 380 through Prosper. Our town has planned for this and made the adjustments for this plan. It is not fair to change our plans because other cities did not plan accordingly. 380 staying on 380 is what is best for Prosper and surrounding areas.	Your comment is noted. TxDOT selected the Blue Alternative as its Preferred Alternative, which includes Segment A along the existing US 380 in Prosper. This means that the new location portion of the freeway would not diverge from the existing US 380 at Coit Road or into the Town of Prosper.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2136	2/17/2023 2/22/2023 2/25/2023 3/10/2023	Unknown	Online (6)	<p>"I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) our friends and family who have a horse rescue and multiple young children under age 5 will be displaced.</li> <li>2) Section C will displace 4X the residents compared to Section D.</li> <li>3) section C will displace 4X the businesses compared to Section D.</li> <li>4) Section C displaces 7 Community Resources, where Section D displaces 0.</li> <li>5) Section C damages one of the largest remaining forests in Collin County, 71% more than Section D.</li> <li>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.</li> <li>7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST)</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
2137	3/16/2023	Unknown	Email	<p>I would like to formally request an extension of the comment period as we need more time to fully evaluate the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be taken to protect Tucker Hill as well as the other communities and businesses affected by Option A. Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>This US 380 Project's comment period has been longer than most because it opened when the DEIS was announced, which was January 13, 2023. TxDOT granted two separate 15-day extensions to the comment period to close April 20, 2023 instead of March 21, 2023 as advertised at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>Detailed study information is available in the DEIS document posted at <a href="http://www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.kwww.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a>.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2138	3/26/2023	Unknown	Online	Segment A is a disaster and will make living in the La Cima neighborhood a nightmare. Officials at the meeting table completely disregarded any of the valid concerns we had, but also could not provide any benefits specifically to those living in La Cima. Right now it takes 9 minutes to drive to Costco on a good day. With this, my calculation (based on the provided plans) puts that same drive at 23 minutes on a good day. This is supposed to alleviate time spent on 380, not add to it for residents of La Cima, who specifically chose this neighborhood for its proximity to 380. The impact tE1201:E1203o property values surely would not be positive, and if our neighborhood group webpage is to be believed, protests for compensation are not out of the question. Leave La Cima out of this. Why not build a few miles up along fm1468? It's a straightshot up there and virtually nobody would be impacted.	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The future US 380 freeway will provide better future travel times than if the project wasn't built.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>There are also impacts and challenges in constructing a freeway north of Bloomdale Road/Prosper Trail, or along FM 1461. Initial traffic analysis conducted during the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study indicated that locating an alternative further north did not address US 380 congestion and would not satisfy regional travel demands.</p>
2139	3/29/2023	Unknown	Email	Please support plan D for the bypass on the East side of McKinney, this will be the best for so many more people lives. Please vote for this route it will not disrupt so many lives.	Your comment and support of Segment D is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.
2140	3/29/2023	Unknown	Online	What happened with 380 staying on 380? I think the proposal is not great for the envoy and would increase polution in residential areas	<p>Your comment is noted. The Green Alternative, or Segment F, from Coit Road to FM 1827 (also referred to as "keeping 380 on 380" or expanding the existing US 380 to a freeway), was identified during the Feasibility Study, but ultimately was not carried forward for further analysis after because it would have displaced more than 30 residents and 200 businesses including Raytheon.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.
2141	4/3/2023	Unknown	Written Comment Form	-Nxt yr -Only you	Your comment is noted.
2142	4/3/2023	Unknown	Written Comment Form	Do NoT buiLd SEg A!!! BuiLd SEg B!!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2143	4/3/2023	Unknown	Written Comment Form	Do NOT BUILD SEG. "A"!! BUILD SEG. "B"!!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2144	2/17/2023	Unknown	Online	No 2 C	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
2145	2/17/2023	Unknown	Online	No to "c". Too many homes. Option D	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2146	2/18/2023	Unknown	Online	No to section c	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
2147	2/22/2023	Unknown	Online	I am strictly opposed to C. Looking at both plans, it makes absolutely no sense at all to execute on plan C. Wake up! Think! How about just give a darn about the communities and environment that children can enjoy. Please reconsider and move forward with the D plan. It is just too much like right. DO THE RIGHT THING AND DO IT NOW.	Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted.
2148	2/22/2023	Unknown	Online	Alternative C makes no sense - more people displaced and business impacted. I vote for Alternative D. OPPOSE C! SUPPORT D! Why are there no displays discussing Segment D?	Your comment, opposition of Segment C and support of Segment D is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices. Multiple displays were not provided for Segment D because it was not included in TxDOT's Preferred Alternative. Detailed information, including information about Segment D, can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides rigorous analysis of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts. There are three categories of analysis that TxDOT can complete as part of NEPA, of which an EIS is the most rigorous.
2149	2/22/2023	Unknown	Online	I live on 2933 it's #420 on insert E. Why can't you shift the bypass to across the street where there is nothing? 200 acres of an absentee owner and it's just used for rental pasture? Why are you destroying 5 ranches on on side when you would not destroy anything on the other side? this makes no sense. Look at the human side of things.	Your comment is noted. The proposed alignment adjacent to property ID #420 depicted in the public hearing schematic serves multiple purposes. Firstly, it aims to provide an optimal alignment that intersects the railroad at a right angle while minimizing any negative effects on inhabited structures. Secondly, it seeks to maximize the existing right-of-way from FM 2933 and maintain consistent drainage outfall conditions downstream. Thirdly, the proposed alignment attempts to minimize direct impact on local businesses along CR 332. Finally, by minimizing the number of horizontal curves and providing larger than minimum radii within the freeway's alignment, the intention is to decrease the overall number of accidents along the corridor. Shifting the alignment and or adding additional curves to impact an absentee owner in order to avoid ranch properties will likely minimize the effectiveness of the purposes listed above.
2150	2/17/2023	Unknown	Online	No to C as it will affect more home owners and businesses.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2151	4/18/2023	Unknown	Email	<p>As a McKinney homeowner and taxpayer, I find that TXDOT's recommendation of Segment A over Segment B is fiscally irresponsible to the taxpayers costing over \$150 million more, applies criteria to support their decision inconsistently, and provides numerous biased, false, and inconsistent findings in their environmental study. Furthermore, there is objective evidence of political maneuvering, campaigning, and rezoning efforts by the City of Prosper and ManeGait that ostensibly has swayed TXDOT's position, and I publicly condemn these actions as unethical and improper.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>
2152	4/20/2023	Unknown	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	NO TO SEGMENT A yes TO b	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2153	4/20/2023	Unknown	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	STRONGLY OPPOSE the construction of segment A and STONGLY SUPPORT the segment B construction option.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2154	4/20/2023	Unknown	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I oppose segment A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2155	3/23/2023	US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Email	<p>Mr. Endres,            Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the US 380 McKinney Coit Road to FM 1827 project developed to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These comments are provided under the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act with the Corps acting as a cooperating agency. I misread the deadline for comments thinking it was today but wanted to make sure you received these since they are critical to the permitting path of the proposed action. The EIS and appendices indicate that all impacts to waters of the United States qualify for authorization under the provisions of Nationwide Permit (NWP) 14. There is inadequate detail to allow a confirmation of that conclusion. Concern exists relative to: • The amount of impacts reflected in the document primarily associated with a target area of Segment C near and between stations 1880+00 thru 1940+00 (East Fork Trinity River and Clemons Creek - delineation polygons generally 287 thru 299). There is conflicting information between the delineation report in the DEIS Appendix N maps (i.e., Figure 8-18 which shows no wetlands surrounding Clemons Ck - delineation ID # 293) and the 60% schematic sheet (Roll 15 of 42) from Appendix B which reflects a large wetland feature for the same area. • An in-office review of the delineation information for this area reveals that there appear to be multiple wetland polygons not identified which brings into question the accuracy of impacts to occur with this section of the project. • The DEIS does not specify how the impact to more than 4+ acres of forested wetlands in this reach (as well other areas) are classified as temporary rather than permanent. • Although not a defined concern, the DEIS does not indicate whether the proposed project will implement a design-build approach to development. Such an approach can generate additional concerns and issues relative to impacts and permit type applicability. These items require more explanation and clarification to support the conclusion that the overall project qualifies for NWP coverage. A site visit is needed to confirm the accuracy of the delineation for this reach, as well as other sites, associated with the corridor. Initial coordination with TXDOT staff has occurred on this but was being held until evaluation of the DEIS was completed. Scheduling of a site visit will occur shortly. Given the above, it is believed that the project will require a Standard Individual Permit (IP). The following comments are provided in light of that view to ensure that Corps concerns are identified during the allotted comment period on the DEIS. As details are refined and if it is demonstrated that only NWPs are required, the comments related to an appendix, the need and purpose, and the alternatives analysis would become inapplicable.</p> <p>Specific Comments            To adequately address the 404 permit process and not interfere with the format of the EIS, it is recommended that the development of a 404(b)(1) Appendix be accomplished since substantial additional information is needed to address these regulations. Such an appendix is a common strategy that eliminates interference with the format and flow of the lead agency's EIS by avoiding the conflict that can arise between the 404(b)(1)s</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. The 60% Schematic shows the section from station 1880+00 through 1940+00 as bridged over the creek, associated wetlands, and floodplain areas. The 60% schematics also used an older background aerial and earlier photo interpreted features. All features were photo interpreted before conducting field delineations where property access was granted. After the completion of field delineations, delineated features were updated for the properties where access was obtained. For properties where access was not granted, additional photo interpretation was conducted based on the context of adjacent features that were field delineated or by looking across the fence (from public rights-of-way) to get a better understanding of what was shown on the aerials and other referenced datasets. Water Features 287-291, 193, and 297 were field delineated. Water features 292*, 294*-296*, 298*, and 299* were photo interpreted (indicated by the *) based on review of digital datasets and context clues from field work on adjacent properties. The 95% Schematics to be included in the FEIS will show the water features as indicated in the Water Features Delineation Report (Appendix N).</p> <p>As mentioned above, areas where access was not granted were photo interpreted by reviewing multiple datasets and updated using information gained from looking at those areas from public rights-of-way or adjacent property lines. Additionally, delineation of similar nearby areas improved our understanding of signatures that stand out on an aerial. Once TxDOT has acquired the properties and prior to starting the permitting process, the photo interpreted areas will be field delineated in accordance with the 1987 Delineation Manual and Great Plains Regional Supplement guidelines. As discovered by conducting field delineations for this project and others in the DFW area, many of the flooded areas and large NWI mapped features associated with Honey Creek, Clemons Creek, and the East Fork Trinity River are not wetlands and many of the stream channels are deeply incised. These stream reaches occasionally flood out of their banks but the water quickly recedes and does not create anerobic soil conditions for 14 or more days. Also, flooding takes place more often over the winter months and as often during the growing season.</p> <p>Discussion of permanent vs functional loss impacts and applicable mitigation will be added to Section 3.10.1 of the FEIS. A water feature-specific mitigation trigger table will also be included in support of that discussion. Item 3 of the mitigation list will be removed.</p> <p>At this time, TxDOT intends to implement the US 380 McKinney project through a traditional design-bid-build process.</p> <p>As noted previously, not all properties were accessible at the time the field delineations were conducted, and additional rights-of-entry won't be obtained by TxDOT until the ROW is acquired. TxDOT will need to verify that access is still granted for the previously accessed properties prior to conducting the site visit which could be conducted during final design.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>limitations and NEPA evaluations. It also provides an efficient and targeted review for those entities interested in 404 resources and issues.</p> <p><b>Need and Purpose</b>                      Section 1.4 – For an IP evaluation, the purpose statement on page 1-7 is considered to be too general in relation to the proposal needing a permit. It appears to portray the overarching objective of the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study (CCFS) as well as the “Study Area” of that effort rather than the particular portion of the 380 corridor, between Coit Road and FM 1827, which is the subject of the DEIS. This issue was generally noted in the Corps’ December 16, 2022 comments on the Spur 399 Extension DEIS. The CCFS evaluation is a “high-level” effort conducted to “identify a recommended corridor and appropriate roadway type” that “would need to accommodate the projected east-west travel demand and provide a safe and accessible facility to support east-west mobility across Collin County in the year 2045 and beyond.” The CCFS addresses broader considerations and geographic areas than what the current proposal is focused on. This can create incongruities in the application or straight transference of the CCFS purpose to the current project in light of the 404(b)(1) guidelines and the evaluation of alternatives under an IP. The Corps is unaware of a programmatic or broader NEPA document that accompanies the CCFS which would allow for tiering (40 CFR 1502.20 and 28) to the current proposal. The Corps, for evaluation of the permit action under the 404(b)(1) guidelines, would define the overall project purpose as “To safely accommodate current and projected traffic volumes on US 380 between Coit Rd and Farm to Mark (FM) Road 1827.” While some of the data and information in the CCFS would be used to support this definition, its use is not an all-embracing acceptance of the CCFS for our permit evaluation purposes because the CCFS includes considerations beyond the needs associated with the target reach and it was not formulated to ensure compliance with the 404(b)(1)s.</p> <p><b>Alternatives</b>                      Section 2.0, page 2-1 – The analysis of alternatives is not adequate to address the requirements of the 404(b)(1) guidelines. The CCFS, which the DEIS relies upon to identify and reduce initial options to the recommended alignments in the DEIS, as well as the screening of alternatives in the DEIS, do not contain adequate detail supporting the referenced screens, do not specify how alternatives were eliminated in light of said screens, and incorporate factors/screens or determinations that do not comport with the 404(b)(1) guidelines. This prohibits the determination under the 404(b)(1)s that the proposed action (Blue Alternative) is the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). Additionally, the information displayed in the DEIS final alternatives comparison of impacts to waters of the US (Figures 2-15 and 3-46) demonstrates that the preferred alternative is not the LEDPA. It is noted that comments were not provided on the previous information concerning alternatives screening efforts because the Corps was anticipating the project would only involve NWP’s based on statements previously provided to us. It is recommended that to most efficiently address the 404(b)(1) screening process to identify the LEDPA is</p>	<p>TxDOT intends to continue to avoid/minimize impacts to water features by bridging such features and floodplains to the extent practicable and feasible.</p> <p>To keep the FEIS-ROD development on schedule, TxDOT will address the possible need for a Standard Individual Permit (IP) and provide information to support the USACE’s review of the proposed project under Section 404(b)(1) guidelines during the final design process as design modifications could be considered to further refine the Blue Alternative. As noted previously, additional properties will need to be accessed and field delineations conducted to complete the assessment of project impacts along with monitoring of the changing regulatory environment during the final design phase.</p> <p>This McKinney project is one of five projects of independent utility identified as part of the Recommended Alignment in the US 380 Collin County Feasibility Study (CCFS). No broad or programmatic NEPA documentation was prepared for the Recommended Alignment prior to TxDOT initiating separate and independent NEPA evaluations for each of the five projects. The “Study Area” for the US 380 McKinney project is bounded by Coit Road on the west, FM 1827 on the east, the northern boundary of Erwin Park on the north, and existing US 380 on the south (see definition on page 3-2 of the DEIS). The purpose statement, although similar to that of the CCFS, is applicable to this specific US 380 project. The needs describe the more specific issues within this Study Area – the effects of population growth (with McKinney and Prosper seeing the most historic growth) and increasing traffic congestion through McKinney that are exacerbated by growth across the county; reduced mobility, primarily due to the lack of other east-west regional arterials (US 380 is the only arterial across Collin County and traveling through the heart of McKinney); and high crash rates along existing US 380 through McKinney caused by high traffic congestion.</p> <p>The CCFS screened more than 100 alignments (most crossing through the US 380 McKinney Study Area) to recommend a contiguous alignment across Collin County. For the US 380 McKinney project (Coit Road to FM 1827), alignments previously studied and removed during the CCFS were brought back for consideration during the NEPA process with some modification as Segments B and C; and other alignments were considered in making minor modifications to Segments A, E, and D. TxDOT considered more than water features in making the decision to select a preferred alternative, including making decisions on where bridged sections are used versus earthen embankment to not only avoid/minimize impacts to all type of resources but to also provide a balance between impacts and project costs. Improving existing US 380 was the initial focus of the CCFS, but because of numerous constraints along the section through McKinney and the resulting impacts of considering an 8-lane freeway and frontage roads between Coit Road and FM 1827 that would remove more than 200</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>to focus on impacts to waters of the US rather than practicability screening, starting with the original universe of options in the CCFS and continuing through the DEIS options (Figure 2-1). The attached white paper outlines the evaluation process and the ability to consider either prong (waters impacts OR practicability) in the screening of options. It is noted that practicability screens and determinations do not include factors such as economics (compared to costs) and noise. Statements such as “best meet” are also problematic in satisfying the LEDPA analysis in determining practicability. Additionally, many of the factors listed in Figure 2-13 also do not affect the practicability of alternatives or the Least Environmentally Damaging requirement. Lastly, if effects/impacts to other natural resource factors are proposed to be used as part of the alternatives analysis for 404(b)(1) compliance, those can be effective if they rise to the level of significance and are applied and considered normally after the identification of the LEDPA. A couple of examples of statements in the CCFS that lack adequate support or detail include: • For the “Initial Alignments” in section 5.1, there is no specific information included to support the reduction in options. Just a bulletized list exists and a statement relative to the options “did not address the problems identified in Section 3.0 if they were deemed too negatively impactful.” • For the “Viable Alignments” and their refinement (Sections 5.2 and 5.3), specific information is needed based on the TDM runs (section 5.1.1 - Figure 5-2) as well as the “Other Analysis” (section 5.1.1.1) efforts. The results of the modeling with an explanation of the distances away from the existing alignment that were determined to be “too far” needs to be included. How did each alignment address any established screening criteria to determine they were not practicable or resulted in greater or comparable impacts to water features? It is re-emphasized that for the purposes of the 404(b)(1) analysis, if an alternative is practicable in light of the overall project purpose, then it needs to be carried forward in the evaluation, unless it would have greater impacts to waters of the United States. This requirement of evaluating options in light of the overall project purpose creates some concern relative to the difference in the purposes between the CCFS and the current project as alluded to in the previous comments concerning Need and Purpose. It is recommended for the 404(b)(1) analysis that the options contained in the CCFS be evaluated in light of the more general CCFS purpose (as supported by the objective of that document) and then those remaining alternatives carried from the CCFS screening be evaluated in light of the more refined purpose identified above for the Coit Rd – FM 1827 overall purpose. Section 2.3.2, page 2-32, top of page (Figure 3-43, page 3-133, and other locations in the DEIS) – If an IP is required for the project, references to NWP 14 should be scrubbed from the document and appendices. Section 2.4, page 2-38 states: The Blue Alternative (A+E+C) is recommended as the Preferred Alternative and has been developed to a higher level of detail than the other reasonable alternatives to facilitate the development of mitigation measures and concurrent compliance with other applicable laws. Please describe how and where the impacts of the preferred alternative were</p>	<p>businesses and 40 residences, new location alignments were focused on around McKinney in the CCSF. For these reasons, improving existing US 380 between Coit Road and FM 1827 was not studied further and removed from consideration in the DEIS.</p> <p>TxDOT does not anticipate the need for a Standard Individual Permit (IP). As noted previously, additional field delineations need to be completed once TxDOT has acquired the ROW, final design is anticipated to take at least two years through which minor modifications could be made to the design that could further minimize or avoid impacts to potentially jurisdictional water features, and TxDOT will continue to monitor the regulatory changes to determine the best path forward. If during final design it is determined that an IP is needed, compliance with EPA’s Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines would be confirmed prior to submittal of the Individual Standard Permit.</p> <p>Under each section of the DEIS, the “Preferred Alternative” description indicates additional details and findings specific to the Blue Alternative. The FEIS will capture additional analyses and refined impacts for the Blue Alternative reflecting the iterative process of developing further design details (additional ROW needs and design changes) as will be depicted in the 95% Schematic. The discrepancy between the values presented on page 3-84 for the Blue Alternative (and in Figure 2-15 Alternatives Comparison Matrix, page 2-36 of the DEIS), is that the wetland feature types have been summed to present the permanent and temporary impact totals, instead of by water feature type. Figure 3-46 in the FEIS will be revised to sum the permanent and temporary impacts for each water feature type group (e.g., streams, wetlands, ponds).</p> <p>Changes to impacts due to alignment shifts or incorporation of different design would be described in the FEIS for the Blue (Preferred) Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT places the responsibility on the contractor to select, evaluate, and obtain appropriate clearances and permits for borrow/source material sites. If additional cultural resources or water feature surveys are needed for such sites, TxDOT will coordinate the completion of those with the contractor.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>refined in contrast to the other options. Impacts are shown in Figures 2-15, 3-46 and a Table in Appendix N. Page 3-133 states that an initial impact assessment was completed and refers to the Table in Appendix N. (It is noted that page 3-84 lists impacts to water features and refers to Figure 3-46 yet the numbers in the text do not match what is in the Figure. This figure cites the Impact Table in Appendix N but has higher totals than what is in Figure 2-15). Impact totals in Figure 2-15 are lower than those reflected in Figure 3-46 which indicates that all alternatives may have been refined. However, that does not comport with the above statement on page 2-38. Please specifically identify in the DEIS what the additional refinement of the Blue Alternative involved, where in relation to the alternatives analysis the refinement occurred, and what the total impacts are anticipated to be. It is urged that a compilation table of the impacts to waters were at the varying levels of analysis be provided rather than having to look at 3 locations in the EIS with differing totals. It is important for the alternatives analysis screening process, based on impacts to waters, to use the same methods and degrees of refinement at each level and that consideration of more refined data not be utilized at coarser level screens. It also noted that based on the summary numbers in Figures 2-15 and/or 3-46, the preferred alternative is not the LEDPA.</p> <p>Impacts, Mitigation and Other Items</p> <p>Please provide a refined description as to how the acreage and linear feet of impacts to wetlands and waters were calculated and what activities are involved in the assessment. This also needs to be accomplished for the classification of the impacts being temporary vs. permanent for each feature as reflected in Figures 2-15 and 3-46 and broken out in Appendix N. Areas of permanent vs. temporary effects should be shown on plans that have been provided and thoroughly described. Any avoidance and minimization actions taken with the alignments also need to be detailed. As described in the DEIS, the identification of waters was accomplished in the environmental footprint with a narrower Project Area/ROW. Therefore, alignment shifts, incorporation of differing project designs, and other actions taken to reduce impacts in relation to specific impact areas and water feature polygons need to be described (similar to what is described at the top of page 2-32).</p> <p>Page 1-135. The listing of mitigation being required for various reasons needs to be deleted from the DEIS if an IP is required and reference to the mitigation rule (33 CFR 332 and 40 CFR 230.90 thru 98) added. If the project qualifies for NWP coverage then the listing should remain except for item 3) which needs to be removed. There is no numerical limitation set relative to a minimum acreage level for mitigation. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Compliance – The Corps fully recognizes TxDOT as the lead Federal agency to ensure compliance with this statutory responsibility. Due to current personnel limitations and workload, the DEIS for this specific resource area has not been reviewed relative to this statutory responsibility. It is our intention to defer as much as possible to the efforts of TxDOT. No comments are provided relative to information concerning the Endangered Species Act (ESA) contained in the</p>	

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>DEIS.            The DEIS does not identify or include the source area for materials associated with the project. This is a required item associated with a permit application as required at 33 CFR 325.1(d) which states: • All activities which the applicant plans to undertake which are reasonably related to the same project and for which a DA permit would be required should be included in the same permit application. • If the activity would include the discharge of dredged or fill material into the waters of the United States or the transportation of dredged material for the purpose of disposing of it in ocean waters the application must include the source of the material. Source material sites can involve ESA and Section 106 of the NHPA compliance responsibilities as well as other requirements. Because TxDOT is the lead agency for the project and applicable statutes, the Corps wants to avoid having to potentially undertake workload for such responsibilities. It is recommended that a proposed source area be identified and evaluated in the DEIS. If the source site location changes as the project develops then such changes can be addressed by the lead agency. The Corps appreciates the opportunity provide comments on the DEIS, please contact me if there are questions concerning these comments and the 404 regulatory process.            Chandler J. Peter            Regulatory Technical Specialist            Regulatory Division, Fort Worth District            817-886-1736</p>	
2156	2/25/2023	VA Hansen	Online	<p>I support the Preferred Alignment (A+E+C) chosen by TxDOT. Two slides captured the specifics very well:            * Least amount of new ROW            * Not displace community facilities            * Least impactful on floodplains            * Lower potential impacts to planned future residential homes            * Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road            * Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment            * Avoids impact to ManeGait property            * Meets the project purpose and need            TxDOT also acknowledges that Segment B conflicts with the land use and thoroughfare plans of Prosper. Maintaining 380 on the current location through Prosper is the appropriate course of action, as Prosper has been very diligent and specific with their thoroughfare planning for 380 expansion through town, and has proper setbacks for most of the alignment. The numerous developments west of Custer should not be needlessly destroyed/impacted by Segment B.</p>	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
2157	4/20/2023	Val M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A, Yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2158	3/9/2023	Val Potash	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from Mail for Windows	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2159	3/7/2023	Valerie McClintock	Email	Stephen, I'm a resident of Stonebridge and I strongly oppose the construction of segment A. The correct decision would be to use Segment B, which is cheaper and will lessen the tax burden for McKinney residents. Segment B would also destroy less businesses and homes! I STRONGLY urge you to implement Segment B. Thank you, Valerie McClintock	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2160	2/24/2023	Valerie Potash	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Valerie Potash Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2161	3/7/2023	Valerie Potash	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. PLEASE!!! You personally will not be affected, WE WILL!!!! Regards, Valerie Potash Sent from my iPhone	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2162	2/17/2023	Valinda Bruce	Online	<p>I totally opposed the recommended section C of the proposed route. It will destroy many more homes, farms, ranches and businesses not to mention destroying more forest and wetland. The alternative D had very little to no public opposition and utilizes mostly flood plain and farm land making it much less disruptive to the community. While D might cost more to build, it disrupts far fewer humans and less irreplaceable forest land. Please choose people over dollars!!</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. Public input is an important factor but it is not the only factor that TxDOT must consider under NEPA. There are multiple reasons why TxDOT has identified the Blue Alternative (Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative. This reasoning is detailed in Section 2.4 of the DEIS.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p>
2163	4/20/2023	Vanessa B	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to segment A, YES to segment B</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2164	2/24/2023	Vanessa Beattie	Email	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2165	4/3/2023	Vanessa Beattie	Written Comment Form	to txDot: WHY SPEND MORE MONEY, DiSRUPt LiFE QUALitY OF MORE HOUSEOWNERS AND DESTROY MORE BUSiNESSES WHEN OPTiON B iS THE MOST EFFiCiENT OPTiON. I SAY NO to OPTiON A! BE A GOOD StWARD OF WHAT HAS BEEN ENTRUSTED YOU. YOU KNOW OPTiON A MAKES NO SENSE. VANESSA BEATTIE [REDACTED]	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. Detailed information can be found in the DEIS document and multiple appendices posted at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/US380EIS</a> . An EIS is a multi-year environmental review process, guided by State and Federal requirements, that provides the most rigorous analysis conducted by TxDOT of proposed alternatives and their environmental impacts.
2166	3/16/2023	Vanessa Beattie	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2167	2/25/2023	Vanessa Walls	Online	I am very much in favor of the Blue Line option.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.



Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2168	3/31/2023	Varnika	Email	<p>Dear Texas Department of Transportation, McKinney, and Prosper, I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed 380 Bypass highway project, specifically the portion that will span the cities of McKinney and Prosper known as route A and Route B. While I understand that the purpose of this project is to manage congestion, improve traffic flow, and enhance safety, I would like to bring to your attention the issues with Plan A and the advantages of Plan B. As it currently stands, Plan A would require the highway to go through just one city, resulting in a higher expense to the taxpayers and would not bypass as much of the major roadway. This plan would force the road to run from north to south, which is not optimal for relieving traffic from east to west. Furthermore, Plan A would cut off the entire community of Tucker Hill from the city and displace more residences, which would have a significant impact on the community and environment. In contrast, Plan B would mostly go through McKinney and run through Plano for about a mile. Plan B would bypass highway 380, avoid cutting off the entire community of Tucker Hill from the city, and displace only a minimal number of residences, a horse farm, and some planned communities. Plan B is the most cost-effective plan and better meets the need for bypassing highway 380, improving east-west traffic flow, and enhancing safety. Plan B would also have less of an impact on the community and environment compared to Plan A. It is concerning to hear that special interests in Prosper are putting pressure on the government to build the more expensive and inefficient highway, despite the fact that its residents will also benefit from the bypass. It is unethical for Prosper to insist that it does not bear any land annexation when its residents will enjoy traffic relief as well. As taxpayers and residents, we must look at the long-term benefits and costs of each plan. Plan B is the best option as it is more cost-effective and better meets the need for bypassing highway 380, improving east-west traffic flow, and enhancing safety. We must consider the impact that the project will have on the community and the environment for decades to come.</p> <p>Therefore, I urge the Texas Department of Transportation, McKinney, and Prosper to build Plan B. Furthermore, I suggest that if the taxpayers of Prosper want to build a more expensive roadway to their advantage, then their taxpayers should bear the expense. This is a fair and just approach that ensures that each city bears the cost of their respective projects. Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I look forward to hearing back from you on this important matter. Sincerely, Varnika</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety.</p> <p>According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A also results in fewer impacts to planned future residential homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Avoids displacing numerous proposed residences under construction west of Custer Road</li> <li>-Utilizes more of the existing US 380 alignment</li> <li>-Avoids impact to ManeGait Therapeutic Horsemanship property, the subject of substantial public concern</li> <li>-Requires acquisition of less ROW than Segment B</li> </ul> <p>While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>
2169	4/20/2023	Vee G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Yes to B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2170	2/21/2023	Vee Miller	Email	I do not support plan C of the 380 bypass. It's ridiculous.	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
2171	1/20/2023	Venkata Amilineni	Email	Hello, I own 2 homes in the area: 600 Falcon, Prosper ( Lakes of La Cima) 12005 Beckton, McKinney ( Prestwyck community) Please let me know if these homes are likely to be displaced by the proposed construction. Thanks Venkata Amilineni Janakivallabh, LLC	Email response from TxDOT on 1/20/2023:  They are not in the proposed right of way. They will not be displaced as shown.
2172	2/22/2023	Venkata Nitin Chilukuri	Online	Need for the Sound barriers at the junction of Roll 4 and Roll 5 as these are very close to the residences that are existing with little children's. There is a need for barriers such as the fences at the junction of Roll 4 and roll 5 to prevent crime and illegal foot traffic and secure the existing residences that are currently habituated. The introduction of the freeway also brings in lot of inconvenience to the current residents as it becomes difficult to get in and get out of the community. There is a substantial increase in the noise level as the closer proximity of the freeway will bring more vehicular traffic and the engines roar shall disturb the residents.	Your comment and concern about traffic noise is noted. A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050. In areas where a noise impact was projected to occur, noise barriers were evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness. TxDOT's evaluation shows the Heatherwood neighborhood currently has a brick privacy wall or barrier of some type that would reduce noise, therefore making the area unable to meet feasibility and reasonableness requirements.  During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will develop a detailed traffic control plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during and after construction completion.
2173	4/20/2023	Veronica D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No on Segment A It will destroy and ruin hundreds of businesses and communities. A fat NO.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2174	4/20/2023	Veronica K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I vote No to A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2175	4/20/2023	Vicki F	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Our Neighborhoods will be filled with Noise & Congestion due to Plan A ...Plan B is the lesser of 2 evils!!!! We happened to like the country environment when we bought our home!! All that is lost with a Major freeway running thru our neighborhood!!!! Plus the animals needlessly killed from All the Major Construction!!!!!!!!!!	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2176	4/20/2023	Vicki P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to Segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2177	4/20/2023	Vicki S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	dropping down at Segment A still leaves much of 380 with congestion. It seems to make more sense to extend the re-entry down further. Segment B just makes more sense.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2178	3/6/2023	Vicki Yue	Email	Hi Stephen, As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Vicki Yue	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2179	4/20/2023	Victor D	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	YES to Segment B only	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
2180	3/28/2023	Victoria Gorpin	Email	Senator Paxton, Representative Leach, and Mr. Endres: I strongly oppose Segment C and support Segment D due to the lower environmental impact and less homes, businesses, and community services affected. Thank you, Victoria Gorpin	Your comment, opposition of Segment C, and support of Segment D is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2181	3/15/2023	Victoria Kleckner	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Victoria Kleckner	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2182	3/8/2023	Virgil Renz	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Best Regards, Virgil Renz	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2183	3/7/2023	Virginia Ann Dover	Email	To TxDOT: NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Please consider this option over Segment A. Segment A will destroy more businesses, cost many millions more to build, and cause greater disruption. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Virginia Ann Dover	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2184	4/19/2023	W W	Online	Thank you for receiving comments. As a concerned citizen for our local community in Prosper, I believe the blue route proposal to be best. Projects to keep traffic flow optimum have been done over the years in Prosper with the most recent being the widening of Custer. It's time for McKinney to own their poor planning and support the 380 traffic congestion that occurs in McKinney. This could and should have been a consideration prior to allowing the multiple businesses to open that constrict lane expansion. Let them enjoy the tax dollars AND the blue route. I would hate to see areas, such as Mane Gait, disrupted because of the considered alternatives. Thank you.	Your comment and support of the project is noted.
2185	3/7/2023	Walt and Cheryl True	Email	As a homeowner and citizens of McKinney, TX for the last 20 years, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, Walt & Cheryl True	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2186	4/18/2023	Walt and Jenny Boyko	Email	<p>Mr. Enders, My wife and I are in our mid-70's and live in Tucker Hill and are very concerned about the 380 bypass and the impact it will have on our golden years of retirement. We both feel that Segment B would have been the best choice for our front porch community and the least disruptive. The meetings we've attended left us with more questions than answers. How can Tx Dot with a clear conscience justify spending \$150 million more for option A when our country's in debt up tp their ears??? Our concerns are in regard to the Noise Pollutants study which we feel are inadequate since we'll be 900 feet from the bypass. Also, our safety coming to and from our home during the construction period is of the most importance. We ask that you please reconsider the decision you've made in selecting Option A.</p> <p>Regards, Walt and Jenny Boyko 7309 Stanhope st. McKinney, Texas 75071 Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>
2187	3/16/2023	Wanye Wells	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2188	3/16/2023	Warren Chase	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
2189	2/6/2023	Warren Nelson	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3 1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative) 2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons: - it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives - it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets - it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community - it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
2190	3/6/2023	Wayne Browder	Comment Form	<p>Public Hearing - US 380 from Coit Rd. to FM 1827                      Concern - routing of Segment C vs D in Area 3 of of from Hwy 5 to FM 1827 connection on East side reconnection to Hwy 380                      Comments:                      1. Has anyone in the TxDot considered the tremendous traffic on Hwy 380 East of this proposed connection at FM 1827. To correct the problem with Hwy 380 traffic flow; this area from McKinney to Princeton would need to be addressed. Your plan does not correct this growing concern.                      2. As to your choice between proposed segment C or D for the routing from HWY 380 to Hwy 5. It is obvious that segment D would be the better choice when consideration of affected homes &amp; businesses is considered. By your own map (page 3 defining proposed routes) 60+ homes and businesses would be impacted on segment C: where as 15 would be affected on segment D.                      3. In addition, selecting segment C would require rerouting of water and Utility service this many homes &amp; businesses.                      4. Apparently, by the map (page 3) there has not be made any provisions for the proposed Wilmeth Rd extension to East from its present ending at Hwy 5 from the West.                      5. Routing by segment D would also alleviate the traffic concerns better with the proposed new McKinney airport entrance from the North that to use segment C. All of these factors should be considered, not just what would be the least cost initially.                      Wayne Browder</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment C and support of Segment D is noted. TxDOT is also conducting a schematic design and environmental study for US 380 in Princeton. Routes being considered include a new location freeway to the north of Princeton. More information about that project can be found at <a href="http://www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area">www.keepitmovingdallas.com/projects/us-highways/us-380-from-fm-1827-to-cr-560-princeton-area</a>.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>All segments and alternatives considered by TxDOT would impact utilities.</p> <p>TxDOT has been coordinating regularly with the City of McKinney on connections to local existing and future roadways and plans for the McKinney National Airport.</p> <p>Cost is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.</p>



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2191	3/16/2023	Wayne De Villers	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2192	4/20/2023	Wayne G	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	From point a to b on segment B is shorter than than A Also not as sharp of a curve for safety reasons . So to me this is a no brainer looking at it from an engineering aspect. COST, SAFETY, and consideration for the people and businesses it will hurt. NO TO A.	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. If constructed, the project would adhere to current design standards and address existing deficiencies in the system where feasible. The freeway design eliminates direct access to the mainlanes from driveways and other roadways, and opportunities for left turns or U-turns will only be available at signalized intersections on cross streets, thereby reducing the number of conflict points.
2193	4/3/2023	Wayne Wells	Written Comment Form	I support option "B" Wayne Wells 204 Riviera Drive McKinney 75072	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
2194	3/7/2023	Wendell Gilbert	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sent from my iPad	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2195	4/20/2023	Wendell M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please do not crowd the 380/stone bridge drive areas any further. Move the loop west on 380 toward prosper area and develop around that area. Huge highways in stone bridge area is not a wise idea.	Your comment is noted.
2196	2/25/2023	Wendy Correa	Email	<p>Good evening, I would like to voice my strong opposition to Segment A, and adamant YES for segment B. I am a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, Texas. Please consider the below comments: I strongly oppose construction of segment A because it will cost taxpayers \$98.8 MILLION more and impact 57% more natural wetlands and wildlife. Also, there will be negative impacts on the Tucker Hill, Stonebridge Ranch, and Ridgecrest neighborhoods. I STRONGLY support segment B in the blue alternative because it will require 73% fewer businesses and residential displacements and avoids reconstruction of the 380 &amp; Custer intersection. My neighbor has an entrance/exit on 380 and I work in McKinney. I drive 380 multiple times every single day. I understand the need for an alternative due to congestion, traffic, and overall growth. However, it is common sense based on the numbers that segment B is the most appropriate choice. Numbers never lie and the costs and impact of segment A far outweigh its benefit. Please choose segment B. Thank you, Wendy Correa</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any subdivisions.
2197	4/19/2023	Wendy Dickerson	Email	<p>To whom it may concern: I have lived in McKinney since 1992 and I have seen an amazing amount of change and growth to our city. Some of it has been beneficial, some not. Four years ago my husband and I moved to Tucker Hill. We fell in love with the charm and peacefulness that this neighborhood provided. We have grown to love this community and its uniqueness. I am incredibly concerned about the possibility of 380 segment A going forward. I truly feel that it will be a detriment to the living experience within my neighborhood. I live in the part of Tucker Hill that is close to 380. I am very worried about the increased noise pollution that will result with a highway of this size, even if the lanes are sunken. What is TXDOT prepared to do to make sure that our neighborhood is not affected at all by highway noise? Will you be installing some type of sound barrier? Is it true that segment A would completely cut our neighborhood off from the rest of McKinney?</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted. TxDOT continues to evaluate traffic noise and possible mitigation in several areas, including Tucker Hill. It is important to note that TxDOT is already proposing mitigation as part of the Preferred Alternative by depressing the mainlanes between the Tucker Hill and Stonebridge Ranch neighborhoods to decrease traffic noise and visual barriers.</p> <p>The design for the Preferred Alternative still allows for multiple ways to access areas to the east in the City of McKinney.</p> <p><i>Full comment and response can be found in Section A2 of the Public Hearing Summary.</i></p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2198	3/16/2023	Wendy Hoffman	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2199	4/20/2023	Wendy P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I am against segment A for the US 380 Proposed Route and for Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2200	4/20/2023	Wendy P	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to segment A and yes to Segment B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2201	3/8/2023	Wendy Perrott	Email	Mr. Endres, I'm a homeowner in McKinney, TX and I strongly oppose the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Rd. to FM 1827. I do support the TxDOT existing option, Segment B, which will result in less overall disruption to the 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of others in McKinney. Segment B will cost less and reduce my city tax burden. Please implement Segment B for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Wendy Perrott	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2202	3/16/2023	Wendy Tabraham	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
2203	4/20/2023	Wes C	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>No to Segment A</p>	<p>Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.</p>
2204	2/6/2023	White Horse Ranch, LLC	Segment C Petition	<p>Petition from residents and businesses in opposition of Segment C - TxDOT US 380 EIS: Focus Area 3</p> <p>1. Preferred Bypass Segments/Build Alternatives Segment D (Purple/Gold Build Alternative)</p> <p>2. Why do you support Segment D? I agree that Segment D is the best option for the community for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it affects substantially fewer people, residences, and businesses than other alternatives</li> <li>- it protects the critical wetland ecosystems, forests, and other environmental and ecological assets</li> <li>- it avoids community resources and areas of historical significance valued by the community</li> <li>- it better fulfills the need for the project by carrying more average daily traffic, offering shorter travel times, and providing faster travel speeds than other alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs.</p> <p>Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.).</p> <p>The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Segments C and D did perform similarly in TxDOT's traffic analysis.</p>
2205	3/7/2023	Whitney Carrillo	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you for your time. Whitney Carrillo</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
2206	4/20/2023	Whitney K	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	<p>As a citizen of McKinney, TX., living in the Kensington subdivision of Stonebridge Ranch, I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Segment A directly impacts me, my family, and my neighborhood in a negative way. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. In addition, \"segment A alternate design\" will more NEGATIVELY IMPACT MY COMMUNITY and the Tucker Hill community as the alternate design puts the bypass closer to both communities, which will cause greater noise, construction debris, traffic delays, and decrease the safety in my subdivision. Please consider the THOUSANDS OF CURRENT RESIDENTS and tax payers in these communities that will be NEGATIVELY IMPACTED as opposed to giving the benefit to an upcoming apartment complex that has yet to be built in the path of the current proposed 380 segment A plans.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p> <p>The Segment A shift that was presented as a possible alternative design at the Public Hearing did not shift the proposed right-of-way for the freeway along the existing US 380 to the south of Tucker Hill. The freeway proposed right-of-way was shifted on the curve on the east side of Tucker Hill by approximately zero to 115 feet to the north and west. This is approximately a minimum of 800 feet from any Tucker Hill residence.</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2207	3/9/2023	Whitney Vaughn	Email	<p>Hello, I know all of you have many important affairs to attend to, so I will keep this brief and greatly appreciate you taking time to consider the following. I keep my horse at Tara Royal, one of the business that will be affected by Segment C of the US 380 Bypass NE McKinney. Segment C will adversely affect the serenity and safety of the 40+ horse owners that keep their horses at Tara Royal, as well as the horses. Loud noises from construction and the increased traffic create a huge safety risk while riding a horse, not to mention the added pollution and disruption of attempting to visit our horses. It is one of the last boarding barns in all of North Texas that has the amount of pasture turnout for horses that they do. Pasture turnout is integral to a horse's physical and mental health, keeping a horse in a 12x12 stall all the time is not fair to them. Most of us already drive from quite far away to have a peaceful, safe, and healthy place for our horses, a place where they can enjoy time in the pasture and not stuck in a stall. Even the McKinney Mounted Patrol keeps their horses at Tara Royal and we should all be concerned about the safety of those officers and their horses that perform an important, integral civic duty. Please don't take our peace and safety away. Please don't affect the health and safety of so many animals, horses and wildlife. Please consider Segment D. Not just for all of us at Tara Royal, not just for the horses, but also because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C severely damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>• C destroys 71% more acres of forests and woodlands and 141% more acres of grassland and prairie.</li> <li>• C disturbs the wetland that serve as refuge for wildlife, including beavers, river otters, turtles, migratory and non-migratory water and forest birds, frogs, etc.</li> <li>• C eliminates a large area of suitable habitat for endangered/threatened species.</li> <li>• C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife (prefers Segment D).</li> <li>• C affects and displaces 383% more homes (29 vs. 6), 300% more businesses (16 vs. 4), and more community resources.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you kindly for your time and consideration. Whitney Vaughn</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. During the next phase of project development, TxDOT will break the project into different construction projects. Each construction project will also develop a detailed traffic control plan or construction phasing plan before construction to minimize traffic disruption and outline how access will be maintained during construction. TxDOT will continue to work with adjacent property owners and stakeholders through final design to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods, as feasible. More information about construction phase impacts can be found in Section 3.17 of the DEIS.</p> <p>According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences. In order to determine the number of displacements, TxDOT used Collin County Appraisal District (CCAD) data to review each potentially acquired parcel and anticipated displacement to determine the address, residence type and appurtenant, appraised structures. Sheds, garages, or covered parking structures are not included in the displacement count. Buildings are considered as potential direct displacements if the proposed ROW physically intersects the existing structure. Based on TxDOT's evaluation, no community facilities would be displaced by either Segment C or D. Additionally, new right-of-way would not be acquired from any community facility either. More details about community facilities can be found in Section 3.4 of Appendix K in the DEIS. Community facilities are defined as a physical feature provided – either by the municipality as a public service or by a private entity – within the community for the benefit of the public (e.g., schools, places of worship, community centers, post office, library, etc.). The EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed action on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Historic Resources including any National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or NRHP-eligible structures, landscapes, districts, or archeological sites, including Section 4(f) properties. No NRHP-eligible historic resources would be affected by the Blue Preferred Alternative (Segments A, E, and C). More information about cultural resources can be found in Section 3.8 of the DEIS.</p> <p>Environmental impacts to Segments C and D are comparable. Segment C would impact more jurisdictional wetlands, rivers/streams, forest, prairies and grasslands. Segment D would impact more floodplain and regulatory floodway. Segment C stretches farther east and out of the East Fork Trinity River floodplain after crossing US 75 and SH 5, impacting nearly one-third of the acreage of floodplain and regulatory floodway impacted by Segment D (based on the Segment Analysis Matrix). TxDOT would use bridges to span regulatory floodways and to minimize the placement of fill material, including bridge bents, within both the mapped 100-year floodplain and</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					<p>the regulatory floodways. Selecting a roadway alignment outside of the mapped floodplain and regulatory floodway (such as Segment C) would require fewer bridges or elevated roadway sections to be built reducing anticipated construction costs. As presented in Section 3.11.1 of the DEIS, the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 589 acres of land that consists of a mix of Blackland Prairie/grassland, floodplain/riparian forest and herbaceous habitats, native invasive/deciduous woodland, Edwards Plateau woodlands/savanna grassland, row crops, and some open water based on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)'s Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas (EMST) data. The Purple Alternative (including Segment D) would impact approximately 626 acres of the same general habitats. The Alternatives Comparison Matrix (Figure 2-15) indicates the Blue Alternative (including Segment C) would impact approximately 214.7 acres of riparian and upland forest/woodlands (approximately 36.4% of the proposed ROW not in urban use); 29.7 acres more than the Purple Alternative.</p> <p>TxDOT continues its coordination efforts with TPWD, which is guided by a 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that can be viewed at <a href="https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf">https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/300-02-gui.pdf</a>. For an EIS project, TxDOT is to coordinate with TPWD as well as provide TPWD the opportunity to comment. TPWD commented on impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, forest, grassland habitat, and fish and wildlife species. TPWD comments have been considered and, in fact, the impacts mentioned in their comments were several of the many things TxDOT had to consider when naming the Preferred Alternative; however, the natural resources impacts were not the sole reason behind the Preferred Alternative selection. Additionally, TxDOT has provided mitigation strategies such as the construction of bridges and elevated road sections to span streams and wetlands, minimizing the clearing of vegetation from streams and forested wetlands, and minimizing the placement of fill material in jurisdictional areas. TxDOT would also purchase mitigation credits from stream and wetland banks within service area as mitigation for impacts to waters of the US and wetlands.</p>
2208	3/7/2023	Will Huffman	Email	<p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you, Will Huffman</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2209	3/31/2023	William and Judith Shutt	Email	As homeowners and citizens of McKinney, TX, we STRONGLY OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore we understand that TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and reduce overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. We strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely, William and Judith Shutt 6509 Spring Wagon Drive McKinney TX 75071	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2210	2/17/2023	William Campbell	Online	Build the North Collin County Bypass NOW and scale back this Proposal to needed improvements to 380 and avoid the serious impact to Residents and Businesses along the proposed route. We do not need an 8 lane Interstate style Highway feet from family homes in established communities. Many of the commercial and private vehicles on this road use 380 as a primary route East and West between I-35 in Denton and I20 near Greenville. The future proposed Northern Collin County bypass similar to 121 is the best solution now rather than this proposal. Many currently drive miles to reach the Dallas North Tollway to avoid congestion on local roads when driving North or South to or from Frisco, Plano, and Dallas Thus the argument that drivers will not drive a few miles out of their way to use a dedicated Bypass with no traffic lights and local congestion falls flat. Unfortunately in this proposal everyone loses and Taxpayers are only left with a Political or Legal solution.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. More information about the purpose and need for the project is available in Section 1.0 of the DEIS starting on page 1-1.  Our analysis also shows us that even if all the planned roadways in Collin County, including the Outer Loop, are built, existing US 380 will continue to experience a failing level of service in the future. The regional model shows that both east to west freeways are needed to relieve congestion.
2211	2/21/2023	William Dauria	Online	no c affects more people and farm land	Your comment and opposition of Segment C is noted.
2212	4/20/2023	William E	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	no to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2213	4/3/2023	William E. Gross	Email	Dear Mr. Andres, I have reviewed your Draft Environmental Impact Statement for US 380 from Coit Road to FM 1827 dated December 2022. This is a very thorough and well documented engineering thesis on the study of the various alignment alternatives that were considered! You have chosen the Blue Alignment as your Preferred Route. After reviewing your detailed report and all of the Alternatives that you discussed and after examining your Alternative Comparison Matrix, I have come to the conclusion that the Brown Alignment is the best alignment that you have discussed. My reasons for choosing the Brown Alignment are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the lowest cost.</li> <li>• It is the shortest length of roadway to build.</li> <li>• By my count, your Alternative Comparison Matrix shows that the Brown Alignment scores better than the Blue Alignment 19 times. Whereas, the</li> </ul>	Your comment, support of the Brown Alternative, and opposition of the Blue Alternative is noted. While public input is one of the many factors considered by TxDOT during its decision-making process, a Preferred Alternative is not selected through a voting process, nor is it selected solely based on input from the public, municipal or agency leaders, or elected officials. TxDOT named the Blue Alternative (comprised of Segments A, E, and C) as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the technical reports, considering public and stakeholder input, and thoroughly reviewing evaluation matrices.



Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				<p>Blue Alignment only scores better than the Brown Alignment 9 times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Blue Alignment displaces 35 established businesses as opposed to the 21 business displacements by the Brown Alignment.</li> <li>• The Brown Alignment provides a much smoother alignment for traffic flow than does the Blue Alignment which contains 2 'doglegs'.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding your comments that the Blue Alignment had more public support at the last Town Hall meetings, I offer the following observations. The Prosper Town Council has been vehemently opposed to any US 380 Alignment - from the very beginning - that did not stay along the existing US 380 route. Prosper's attitude is "not in my backyard!" Prosper certainly has the right to voice their opinion. To that end, the Town of Prosper mounted a huge Public Relations effort to solicit and garner the maximum support possible for the Blue Alignment. I believe that if you look at the demographics of the responses that you got for support of the Blue Alignment, that you will find that the overwhelming number of those responses came from folks who reside in Prosper. Of course Prosper residents don't want the 380 Bypass coming through their town and neighborhood. They would much prefer the Bypass be in McKinney! The Engineering and Financial considerations of the project are irrelevant to the Town of Prosper as long as the Bypass stays out of Prosper. To me, it appears that you have done a thorough job of investigating and documenting the various Route Alignments. To me, your analysis and engineering findings are clear: the Brown Route should be the Preferred Alignment. My firm belief is that TxDot should be able to stay above the political fray and make its decisions on analysis of the facts and prudent engineering analysis. You have certainly done an outstanding job of analyzing and presenting the facts. Unfortunately, it appears that you have succumbed to political pressure with your decision to choose the Blue Alignment as the Preferred Alternative. I continue to believe that the Brown Alignment is the Best Alignment that you have identified and discussed.</p> <p>Very truly yours,                      William E. Gross, P.E.                      4879 Geren Trail                      McKinney, Texas 75071                      [REDACTED]                      214-415-9220</p>	

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2214	3/21/2023	William Essington	Email	As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. William Essington 1916 Cortez Ln McKinney, TX 75072	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2215	4/20/2023	William Harrell	Online	This construction would greatly affect my family's small restaurant, cutting off parking and bringing a highway right in front of a peaceful neighbor and quiet restaurant. Please think of the community and the people this affects.	Your comment and opposition of the project is noted.
2216	3/16/2023	William Howard	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2217	4/20/2023	William M	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Please use Segment B to save MUCH more money, homes and businesses. Come on guys - It makes more sense!	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses, including business being built at the time of EIS drafting, and Segment B would potentially displace none.
2218	4/20/2023	William S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	My wife and I say NO to Segment A and YES to Segment B.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2219	4/20/2023	William S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	No to A, Yes to B	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2220	4/20/2023	William S	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	I strongly oppose construction of Segment A for the US 380 bypass. I strongly urge TXDOT to implement Segment B as the preferred option.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted.
2221	4/20/2023	William Sano	Email	<p>Begin forwarded message:</p> <p>After reading many of the comments and concerns about the 380 bypass, I have not yet seen an explanation of why TXDOT might choose to spend \$150M more dollars on a bypass route over the less expensive one. By the time the project is started the costs will soar even more as new commercial and residential projects are being added even now. I can't help but wonder what back room deals have taken place in order for a route to be drawn with such a sharp S-curve that is bound to cause some major accidents in due time. The less expensive route has a reasonable, gradual curve that would be safer and TXDOT engineers know this! It's so obvious! So how do you explain Segment A over B when it comes to safety and the cost to taxpayers? If Bypass Segment A is approved, another crucial safety concern will impact the residents of Tucker Hill. TH residents' only entrance and egress into their community would be from Highway 380 while it is under construction. That is also the only route available to first responders. As a former firefighter and paramedic, I can personally attest to the fact that seconds matter when it comes to life or death emergencies. At this point in time, there seems to be no alternative route for emergency responders and we have all been delayed in traffic due to construction. How will TXDOT address this concern? I read also about environmental impact, a worthy consideration especially with our dwindling green spaces and the encroachment on wildlife. Yet, little consideration is given to the impact on the quality of human life.</p> <p>William Sano 7421 Ardmore St McKinney, TX 75071 210-262-4884 Sent from my iPhone</p>	<p>The design for Segment A meets the criteria outlined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual, including stopping sight distance. Similar freeway curves can be found in the region including President George Bush Turnpike and I-35 interchange.</p> <p>The preliminary cost estimate for each segment is one of the many factors TxDOT considered when determining the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Figure 2-13 of the DEIS. As final design continues, cost estimates will be updated, and will factor in the costs of right-of-way acquisition. Impacts to future developments will also be re-evaluated. It is important to note that these costs are high-level estimates, using the information available now.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would maintain the two existing entry points to Tucker Hill from the existing US 380 at Grassmere Ln. and Tremont Blvd. Each is accessible from frontage roads. According to Section 3.6.3.3 of the DEIS, TxDOT will coordinate with emergency responders to prevent disruptions in service during phased construction of the proposed project and will develop a traffic management plan as discussed further in Section 3.17. The proposed grade separated interchanges and intersection improvements (including U-turns) along the proposed frontage roads would reduce congestion at major cross-streets allowing emergency vehicles to bypass traffic lights, shortening transit times through the Study Area.</p>
2222	3/7/2023	William Shelt	Email	<p>Dear sir,</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred</p>	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
				option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Thank you. William Shelt 214-585-2375	
2223	2/26/2023	William Vane Martin, Jr	Email	<p>I Strongly OPPOSE Segment A, SUPPORT Segment B of Project of 380 Bypass Project. My name is William Vane Martin, Jr and i am owner and resident of property at 1529 Landon Lane, Wren Creek Addition, Phase II- B, Block C, Lot 2, Stonebridge Ranch Addition, McKinney, Texas 75071. I am a Trustee of 2015 Martin Family Revocable Living Trust to which the property is registered. I strongly OPPOSE Segment A of Project 380 Bypass Project for reasons including but not limited by ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Stonebridge Dr will be one of three major feeder arteries to the bypass,</li> <li>2) increased traffic on Stonebridge Dr will result in decreased traffic safety,</li> <li>3) will result in increased noise and pollution of the adjacent residential neighborhood,</li> <li>4) property values will be impacted negatively,</li> <li>5) endangers an elementary school,</li> <li>6) Segment A costs more than Segment B,</li> <li>7) creates overpass over Custer and Stonebridge Dr,</li> <li>8) cause large interchange above Kensington Village.</li> </ol> <p>I have attached a pdf file confirming the above comments and including 12 photographs of Stonebridge Drive 1500 block, 1600 block, 1800 block, Watch Hill and Lake LaCima which illustrate the residential environment of Stonebridge Drive. I Strongly Oppose Segment A. William V Martin, Jr</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted. The traffic and safety analysis, completed during the EIS process, indicates that the Preferred Alternative effectively meets the criteria of managing congestion, improving east-west mobility, and improving safety. Results of traffic analysis can be found in Appendix I of the DEIS and on the Segment Analysis Matrix.</p> <p>A traffic noise analysis was conducted in accordance with TxDOT's (Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-approved) Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Roadway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Existing sound level measurements were collected at noise-sensitive areas, and noise modeling software was used to predict what noise levels could be expected in 2050.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p> <p>Changes in property values are driven by the value associated with site-specific factors such as accessibility, safety, noise, visual amenities, proximity to shopping, community cohesion, and business productivity. TxDOT cannot reasonably foresee how any of these factors will impact property values.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative will not require right-of-way from any existing or planned school property that TxDOT was made aware of as of March 2023.</p> <p>The proposed interchange near the Kensington neighborhood will not be above any existing homes. This includes any ramps, bridges, or flyovers. The interchange is a two-level interchange similar to the interchange at the</p>

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
					existing US 75 and US 380. It does not have multiple levels like the interchange at US 75 and Sam Rayburn Tollway.
2224	4/20/2023	William Y	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Vote proposal B	Your comment and support of Segment B is noted.
2225	3/16/2023	Xueying W.	Stonebridge Petition	NO to Segment A March 16, 2023 As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.
2226	4/20/2023	Yoko N	Stonebridge Ranch Petition	Not to segment A	Your comment and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2227	2/25/2023	Yvonne Lambeth	Online	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.
2228	2/25/2023	Zachary Hope	Online	NO to Segment A, YES to Segment B As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A and support Segment B in the Blue Alternative as proposed by TxDOT for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.	Your comment, support of Segment B, and opposition of Segment A is noted.

Commenter Number	Date Received	Commenter Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2229	3/14/2023	Zachary Hope	Email	<p>Hi,                      As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge you to implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Sincerely,                      Zachary Hope</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>
2230	2/21/2023	Zark Hopkins	Online	<p>I just moved to willow wood community. we have a peaceful quiet and safe neighborhood. The new high segment C is a terrible plan. The amount of businesses and houses this plan goes through. the noise next to so many people homes, the pollution to farm lands and animals this road runs through. Making decisions like this and the interruption in so many peoples lives should not be taken lightly. The people in our community are working hard for their money, the housing and business market are already very tough these days and to put so many people out in the same city we all live in. I choose SEGMENT D                      Please take action and change our city for the better not the worse!</p>	<p>Your comment, support of Segment D, and opposition of Segment C is noted. According to the addendum in the DEIS Appendix K, Segment D (with the Spur 399 interchange) is expected to potentially displace 20 businesses, while Segment C (with the Spur 399 interchange) would potentially displace 19 businesses. Segment D would potentially displace seven residences, while Segment C would potentially displace 10 residences.</p> <p>The proposed US 380 project could influence future land use changes within the Area of Influence (AOI) (defined in Section 3.15.2 of the DEIS); however, new and planned residential developments are more likely to influence changes in land use patterns, changes in land cover, and induce growth within the AOI than construction of any of the roadway segments. According to input from the City of McKinney, the proposed project would support future commercial and industrial development around Segment C; however, the proposed project would not be the primary factor considered in making land use decisions in the area.</p> <p>Because this project was forecasted to carry more than 140,000 vehicles per day in 2045, TxDOT performed detailed analyses to evaluate potential air quality impacts and to confirm compliance with regional and federal air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act. As required, the project is consistent with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) State Implementation Plan (SIP), the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Mobility 2045 Update, as well as the 2023 – 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TxDOT modeled carbon monoxide concentrations (CO TAQA) and none of the modeled concentrations exceeded the Environmental Protection Agency's 1-hour or 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. TxDOT performed a quantitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) analysis. The total MSAT emissions are predicted to decrease by approximately 43% by 2050 due to higher combustion efficiencies of vehicle engines and electrification of the US fleet. More information about the air quality analysis that was conducted can be found in the DEIS document in Section 3.12.</p>

Committer Number	Date Received	Committer Name	Source	Comment Topic	Comment Response
2231	3/16/2023	Zoie Dearden	Stonebridge Petition	<p>NO to Segment A March 16, 2023</p> <p>As a homeowner and citizen of McKinney, TX., I strongly OPPOSE the construction of Segment A for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827. Furthermore, I understand TxDOT has an existing option, Segment B, that will cost less, reduce the tax burden on McKinney residents, destroy fewer businesses and homes, and result in less overall disruption to 36,000 Stonebridge Ranch residents and thousands of citizens throughout McKinney. I strongly urge TxDOT to Implement Segment B as the preferred option for the US 380 Bypass from Coit Road to FM 1827.</p>	<p>Your comment, opposition of Segment A, and support of Segment B is noted. According to Section 3.6 and the addendum in Appendix K of the DEIS, Segment A potentially displaces two residences and Segment B would potentially displace four residences. Segment A would potentially displace 14 businesses and Segment B would potentially displace none. None of the alternatives studied in the EIS would bisect any existing subdivisions.</p>