

**APPENDIX G: Comments Received from Public Hearing  
and Notice of Availability of the DEIS**

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
1/15/23 20:15	I stand in strong opposition to Segment B - Brown and Gold plans. We are moving to Prosper this March.	Benjamin	Cable	1250 Harvest Ridge Ln	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
1/17/23 14:46	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.					Texas				
1/20/23 1:05	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.	Caleb	Pedersen	2466 County Road 852	McKinney		75071	[REDACTED]		
1/24/23 18:30	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.	Rick	Vander Heiden		Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
1/25/23 23:39	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	Leslie	Jean	3521 Paintbrush Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
1/26/23 1:07	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.	Jeff	T	741 hunters pl	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
1/26/23 23:22	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	Barada	Paul	6383 Francis Ln	Frisco	Texas	75035	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	decision if Txdot decide to move Segment A option. Please consider the alternative option B.									
1/27/23 4:25	NO BYPASS!! Look further north to build a bypass. Do not build into 380.	S	A			Texas				
1/27/23 4:27	Stop trying to build a bypass which both towns and citizens do NOT want!	B	T			Texas				
1/27/23 18:08	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!!!	Sara	A		Prosper	Texas				
1/28/23 23:50	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!!	Douglas	Clark			Texas				
1/29/23 22:49	No Bypass in Propser!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!!	Madeleine	G		Prosper	Texas				
1/31/23 3:21	No Bypass in Propser!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!!	Madeleine	G		Prosper	Texas				
1/31/23 3:40	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!	Benjamin	Smith		Prosper	Texas				
2/4/23 19:06	No! No more widening of 380. 380 needs to reduce speed limits and increase lights in Prosper.	Clay	Johnson			Texas	75078			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/5/23 19:17	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Brandi	Martin	8609 HERN MEADOW	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/10/23 1:00	<p>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>	Mary	Turner		Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/10/23 15:43	<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>	Ivan	Clemons	5404 DATEWOOD LANE	McKinney	Texas		[REDACTED]		
2/11/23 20:17	<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>	Paul	G		Prosper	Texas	75078			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/14/23 19:26	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..	Frank	DeLizza, PE	1601 Stratford PI	McKinney		75071	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 0:05	I fully support the findings of the study and the preferred alignment of Segment A. Thank you!	Ellen	Shaunessy	15B Rhea Mills Circle	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 12:07	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.	Ariana	N			Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 23:10	Option C will be a disaster for our neighborhood and the environment. C divides our neighborhood, splits our road, and separates property from owners. 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. 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. 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.	Gordon	O'Neal	2235 County Road 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 23:23	We need to keep 380 on 380	Matt	Tindall	4181 Splitrock Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 23:32	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	krista	rogers	528 twi knoll dr	mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/16/23 23:35	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!	Tiffany	Nayar	3721 Glacier Point Ct	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 23:37	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	krista	rogers	528 twi knoll dr	mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 23:42	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,	Malcolm	Mulroney	3 Crestview Cir	Lucas	Texas	75002	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 23:49	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.	David	Vidusek	2920 Lakeview Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 23:53	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.	Andrew	Sisson	3866 CR 405	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/16/23 23:54	no to segment C!!!! Catastrophic, stupid, nonsensical. do the right thing					Texas				
2/17/23 0:00	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	Rebecca	Easterwood	2500 FM 2933	mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:08	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.	Clint	Tenney	2912 Ellsworth Ave	Melissa	Texas	75454	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:09	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.	Renee	Francis	1309 Putman Drive	Mckiney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:12	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.	David	Bruce	2118 CR 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:13	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.	Steph	Potter	2662 CR 406	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 0:13	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!	Rachel	Smith	2200 Heather Hill Ln	Plano	Texas	75075	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:14	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.	Heather	McCauley	2200 Heather Hill Lane	Plano	Texas	75252	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:15	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!!!					Texas		[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:16	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.	Tom	Potter	1706 San Jacinto Dr	Allen	Texas	75013	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:18	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.	Rachana	Patel	2516 FM 2933	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:19	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 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.	Tiffany	Hand	2172 CR 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 0:20	<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 preffred 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>	Dhruv	Patel	2516 FM 2933	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:21	<p>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 fesability 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</p>					Texas				
2/17/23 0:24	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Daniel	L.	1724 Sacramento Ter	Plano	Texas	75075	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 0:24	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.	William	Campbell	7208 Ripley Street	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:30	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.	Chet	Fisher	1728 Private Road 5042	McKinney	Texas	75454	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:30	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.	John	Hancock	611 Uvalde Ct.	Allen	Texas	75013	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:38	Segment C would be an utter catastrophe and frankly not only would 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.	Jack	Moore	2804 L Don Dodson Dr	Bedford	Texas	76021	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 0:38	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.	Carolyn	Wilganowski	2101 Proctor Drive	Grand Prairie	Texas	75051	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:40	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.	Andy	Sanders	4809 Plantation Lane	Frisco	Texas	75035	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:44	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.	Jennifer	Swim	2172 CR 338	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:44	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!!	Valinda	Bruce	2118 County Road 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:49	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.	Emily	Falk	5300 Grove Cove Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:52	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.	Lori	Smeby	2940 Greenhigh Ln	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 0:52	We support keeping 380 on 380 through Prosper	M	BD	4040 Teton Pl	Prosper	Texas	75078			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 0:53	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.	Jason	Woodward	6004 Old South Ct	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:01	<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.</p> <p>I will be sure to follow up with an email because I've used my allotted characters.</p> <p>Johnnie Howell</p>	Johnnie	Howell	2172 County Road 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:04	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 displace 0 businesses verses 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	Joseph	Miller	2705 Majestic Avenue	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:06	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 e a bottleneck in the future even after the project is completed	Dale	Bai num	3541 Heritage Trail	Celina	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 1:07	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.	Gary and Beth	Hatch	3112 Maplewood Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:07	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.	Jami	Woodward	6004 Old South Court	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:21	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.	Diego	Valadez	630 W New Hope rd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:23	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.	Christine	Bodin	1713 Freedom Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:24	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.	Jeff	Bodin	1713 Freedom Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 1:24	<p>I am writing to oppose segment "C" and in favor of segment "D."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- C divides residential farming / ranching communities</li> <li>- C affects and displaces more residences (29 vs. 7) businesses (15 vs. 4) and community resources (7 vs. 0)</li> <li>- C damages one of the largest remaining forests in central Collin County</li> <li>- C destroys 71% more acres of forest and woodlands</li> <li>- C disturbs wetlands and suitable habitat for threatened species (per TXDOT)</li> <li>- C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife</li> <li>- C has worse overall traffic performance</li> </ul> <p>Spur 399 can connect equally to segment C or D</p> <p>My Daughter and grandson's home is destroyed by the current route as is my wife's horse rescue operation.</p> <p>I own three properties affected: 2150, 2172 and 2280 County Road 338.</p> <p>Please do the right thing for property owners, businesses and the wetlands and choose segment D.</p> <p>Michael Swim [REDACTED] (214) 673-5439</p>	Michael	Swim	2150, 2172, 2280 CR 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:24	<p>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.</p>	H	Norton	3680 Billy Ln	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:25	<p>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.</p>	Lynne	Hascal	1892 Peacock Trail	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:25	<p>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.</p> <p>GO SEGMENT D!!!</p>	Karla	Degollado	630 W New Hope Rd	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:30	<p>I against C. I prefer D.</p>	M	Adams	4501 Meadow Hill	McKinney	Texas	75070	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 1:30	I'm against C and prefer D.	Gretchen	Adams	4501 Meadow Hill	McKinney	Texas	75070	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:37	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	Lori	Swim	2280 CR 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:41	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.				MCKINNEY	Texas	75071			
2/17/23 1:45	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.	Magan	Tyler	5101 Pinewood Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 1:53	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.	gary	Sanders	2500 fm2933	mckinney	Texas	75071			
2/17/23 1:57	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.	Maria	King		Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/17/23 2:01	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!	Sara	Alston		Prosper	Texas	75078			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 2:03	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!	Douglas	Clark		Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/17/23 2:38	Option B should be THE option chosen and not option A because: -The purpose of a bypass is to bypass the congested areas not slam into them. -Just because Prosper opposes doesn't mean it should be followed. Educate them that an outer loop can spur further growth. -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.	D	G			Texas				
2/17/23 2:52	Roll 13, inset G.  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.	Kevin	Baumgarten	2489 cr 1084	McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		
2/17/23 3:06	Please keep 380 on 380. No need to ruin existing establishments.	David	Adams	1700 gentle way	Prosper	Texas	75078	██████████████████		
2/17/23 12:24	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.	GR	M	PO BOX 2465	Mckinney		75070	██████████		
2/17/23 13:43	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.	Barbara	Crouch	4310 Whitley Place Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	██████████████████		
2/17/23 14:16	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.	Rajiv	Nayar	3721 glacier point court	Prosper	Texas	75078	██████████		
2/17/23 15:11	Please keep 380 on 380 at least thru Prosper.	Mary	Spaulding	2310 Reflection Ln	Prosper	Texas	75078	██████████████████		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 16:12	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.	Joseph	Gebbia	3983 CR 331	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 16:28	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	Linda	Cochran	2731 Meadowbrook Blvd	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 16:30	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.	Martha	McDowell	3983 CR 331	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 16:58	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!	Kenneth	Lyday	105 Forest Ln	McKinney	Texas	75069	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 17:17	NO TO C Effects too many people and businesses	S	A		Anna	Texas	75409	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 17:21	No to C as it will affect more home owners and businesses.					Texas				
2/17/23 17:34	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, Thais Swim	Thaís	Swim		Dallas	Texas		[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 17:35	"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.	Kristi	Sherman	1122 wedge hill rd	Mckinney	Texas	75072			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 17:43	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ul 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. Regards,</li> </ul>	Diane	Bednar	3701 Perkins Lane	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 18:09	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ul 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> </ul> <p>Thank you, Kathryn Shunn</p>	Kathryn	Shinn	2512 Piedra Dr.	Plano	Texas	75023	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 18:10	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ul 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> </ul>	M	W	3202 Vermont Ave	McKinney	Texas	75070	[REDACTED]		
2/17/23 18:20	No 2 C					Texas				
2/17/23 18:31	<p>I oppose Section C and ask that you reconsider section D for the following reasons:</p> <ul 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> </ul>	L	Knight		Allen	Texas	75002			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 18:45	<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>We have had family gatherings and our church life group at this local property.</p>					Texas				
2/17/23 18:53	<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>	Mia	Redd	150 Arbordale Way	Princeton	Texas	75407			
2/17/23 20:54	<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>	Alyssa	S		Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/17/23 21:52	<p>I am still very strongly opposed to Alt A vs Alt B.</p> <p>Alt A has a more significant impact on the La Cima community at Stonebridge.</p> <p>Alt A is more expensive.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The current design for the Custer intersection is dangerous and also prohibits east-west traffic on the access roads.</p> <p>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.</p>	Frank	DeLizza	1601 Stratford Pl	McKinney		75071			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	We are current McKinney taxpayers, not Prosper future taxpayers or developers.									
2/17/23 22:59	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.	Matthew	Mitchell	1621 Lonesome Dove Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/17/23 23:29	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.	Frank	DeLizza	1601 Stratford Pl	McKinney	Texas	75071			
2/17/23 23:42	No to "c". Too many homes. Option D					Texas				
2/17/23 23:50	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	Melinda	Atienza	4171 Freedom Ln	Frisco	Texas	75033			
2/17/23 23:56	Attachment	M	H	406 e Hazelwood st	Princeton	Texas	75071			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/17/23 23:56	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 on 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.	Frank	DeLizza	1601 Stratford Pl	McKinney	Texas	75407			
2/18/23 0:13	No to section c					Texas				
2/18/23 0:20	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.	Susie	Miles	3983 CR 331	McKinney		75071			
2/18/23 2:01	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).	G	M	1141 Three Rivers Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	██████████		
2/18/23 12:55	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 !	Jeffrey	Smith	1320 Monticello	Prosper	Texas	75078	██████████		
2/18/23 14:23		Gordon	Crowe	19C Grindstone Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	██████████		
2/18/23 15:23	Please approve segment A. I live on north Custer Road and support the blue proposed alignment.	R	O			Texas				
2/18/23 15:52	Thank you for choosing the only real solution to US380, using sections A, E and C, and leaving US380 on the current alignment through the Town of Prosper. This leaves Mane Gait largely unaffected as it should, allowing them to provide the critical services they are known for. I am disappointed the diamond interchange at Custer and 380 has been changed to "standard" intersection, but I do understand the reasoning behind the change. I think the diamond interchange would be a "futuristic" feature of this project that brings increased safety over a standard intersection. Thank you.	Brian	Shaunessy	15B Rhea Mills Cir	Prosper	Texas	75078	██████████		
2/18/23 16:32	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	Marty	K		Prosper	Texas	75078			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	be more lights just like in McKinney. They have made 380 great for residents. Keep it as is as slow it down.									
2/18/23 17:55	I believe option "A" best choice for bypass around McKinney	Charmyne	Crowe	19C Grindstone Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/18/23 18:54	I support the blue alternative that is currently the "preferred" schematic shown. Thank you for keeping 380 on 380 through Prosper and protecting ManeGait.	Rebekah	Cooksey	2101 Palo Duro Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/18/23 23:39	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.	Heather	Powell	711 Cherrywood Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/19/23 5:11	Please keep 380 as 380 We don't want to see any homeowner or farmers displaced	Sandra	Ritten	620 Livingston Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/19/23 15:02	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.	Kenneth	Seguin	320 Yosemite Drive	Prosper		75078	[REDACTED]		
2/19/23 20:19	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 sited. The expansion needs to go North so it doesn't disrupt as many current home owners and businesses.	Jose	Ortiz		Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/19/23 20:22	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!	Maria	Ortiz		Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/19/23 20:29	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.	Mark	Smith		McKinney	Texas	75078			
2/19/23 21:00	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.	Jill	Nugent	24 Grindstone Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/19/23 21:08	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.	Frank	DeLizza	1601 Stratford Pl	McKinney		75071	[REDACTED]		
2/19/23 21:24	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.	John	Nugent	4840 Woodruff Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/19/23 21:41	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.	Mary	Nugent	4840 Woodruff Ln	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/20/23 15:11	Why wouldn't you propose the 380 Bypass along the New Outter 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.	Peter	John		McKinney	Texas	75078			
2/20/23 15:20	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.	Jackson	Hurst	4216 Cornell Crossing	Kennesaw	other	30144	[REDACTED]	I_could_benefit_monetarily_or_o	
2/20/23 15:26	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.	Joe	Closs	1104 Royal Oaks Drive	McKinney		75072	[REDACTED]		
2/20/23 16:38	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.	Steve	Richardson	7600 Townsend Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/20/23 18:37	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.	Stephen	Remington	7405 Townsend Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/21/23 2:03	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	Edie	Fife	801 High Willow Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 13:54	no c affects more people and farm land	William	Dauria	14787 County road 525	Anna	Texas	75409			
2/21/23 19:55	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.	Erick	Chapman	2928 Greenhigh Ln	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 20:56	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.	J	B			Texas				
2/21/23 21:28	Attachment	Duke	Monson	500 Farms Rd	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 21:52	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!	Jeremy	Baker	4200 Linwood Ave	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 22:15	Blue is by far the best route.	Mark	Wilson	3B Rhea Mills Cir	Prosper		75078	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 22:53	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,	Shannon	Baker	4200 Linwood Ave	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	owls and so many other animals that we are so fortunate to have in our backyards.									
2/21/23 23:05	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. 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.	Rebecca	Cormier	5728 Lunsford Road	Plano	Texas	75024	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:19	I would prefer D over C	stacy	gozzola	5960 Stacy	Mckinney	Texas	75070	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:29	Gordon & Cathy Bius 14055 Red Oak Circle N  We are concerned about the escalation of highway noise, so we are requesting a noise barrier behind our addition, ie wall, etc.	Gordon	Bius	14055 Red Oak Circle N	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:34	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.	Lauren	Shadle	1508 Shady Bend Dr.	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:44	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!!!!	Andy	Franco	1401 Meadow Run Drive	Prosper	other	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:45	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.	Cynthia	Vanzant	5905 Stoltz Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:47	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,	Chuck	Vanzant	5905 Stoltz Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:48	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.	Marcy	Schlesinger	MemorialDR682 1	Frisco	Texas	75034	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/21/23 23:56	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.	Courtney	Fuller	1216 Baynes Dr.	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:57	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	Kate	Casper	1880 Cornet Ct	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/21/23 23:58	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!	Zark	Hopkins	1216 Baynes Dr	mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 0:03	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	James	Hopkins	1008 Fargo Dr.	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 0:05	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.	Suzette	McKee	2720 Majestic Avenue	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/22/23 0:08	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.					Texas				
2/22/23 0:10	Please value our parks and wildlife. I support segment D.	Ken	Hoffman	5905 Chisholm Trl	McKinney	Texas	75070	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 0:12	I vote to support D	Laura	Davis	6016Wildwood Drive	Mckinney	Texas	75072			
2/22/23 0:17	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?					Texas				
2/22/23 0:18	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 remining 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.	Missy	McPherson	8212 Pine Island Way	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 0:23	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.	Dennis and Lesley	Croysdale	1412 Haverford Way	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 0:29	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.	Nancy	Lawrence	7504 Newhaven Ct	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 0:32	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.	Johanna	Mattox	9213 Chesapeake Ln.	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/22/23 0:35	I live on 2933 it's #420 on inset 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.					Texas		[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 0:59	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.	Richard	Randall	1185 FM 1827	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 1:01	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.	Jill	Price	8008 Craftsbury Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 1:24	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.	Leslie	Jean	3521 Paintbrush Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 1:25	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.	Kennedy	Echeverry	2813 Miramr Dr.	Carrollton	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
2/22/23 1:25	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.	Venkata Nitin	Chilukuri	3525 Paintbrush Dr	McKinney	Texas	75007	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 1:25	oppose C 100% I Support option D	paula	echeverry	2813 Miramar Dr	Carrollton	Texas	75007	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 1:26	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!	Sam	Echeverry			Texas		[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/22/23 1:27	My family is in favor of the approved route A	Daniel	Stockman	2720 Meadowbrook Blvd	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 1:32	<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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	Michael	Swim	2150, 2172, 2280 County Road 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 3:05	<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>					Texas				
2/22/23 3:49	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!	Kacey	J		Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/22/23 4:35	Attachment	Rick	Stuckmann	8000 Castine Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071			<a href="#">Attachment</a>
2/22/23 4:43	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.	Brittney	Morales	321 Mossy Rock Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 5:06	Pick D, not C. D hardly impacts anyone, whereas C intervenes with a lot of people.	Amber	Gurney	11956 Mikaela dr	Frisco	Texas	75033	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 9:46	I do not support this roadway as mapped through Prosper.	Joseph	Fields	630 Willowview Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 9:54	I do not support this roadway option B as mapped through Prosper.	Joseph	Fields	630 Willowview Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/22/23 13:14	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	Kenneth	McCarty	2641 Fairway Ridge dr	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 14:21	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.	Patricia	Strawmyer	2640 Misty Meadow Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 16:44	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.	Greg	Klement	2001 Auburn Hills Pkwy #901	mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 18:04	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.	Mary	Carr	2309 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 18:10	We don't want this. You are destroying our beautiful community.  Stay out!					Texas				
2/22/23 19:13	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!	J	H		Frisco	Texas				
2/22/23 21:04	Please stick to the route you have selected. It's time to get this project going.	G	Ray	341 Stephanie Ln	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 21:34	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.	Judy	Slease	7601 S Ballantrae Dr	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/22/23 21:47	<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.</p> <p>I am also surprised that Section C was chosen, instead of D, considering the number of homes affected by C.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	Erik	Gamborg	2921 INN KITCHEN WAY	MCKINNEY	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 22:18	We strongly oppose Route C and want it changed back to Route D.	Greg	Ishmael	Creek Canyon Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/22/23 22:23	I oppose route C, and want it changed back to route D	Debi	Ishmael	2221 Creek Canyon Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/23/23 2:50	Please keep 380 on 380 in prosper!	Sandra	F	1226 Ash Street	Celina	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		
2/23/23 19:00	<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.)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I promise you people will not forget the risk you are imposing on their lives.</p>	Brian	Frank	7554 Hanover street	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/23/23 22:12	<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>	April	Rice	8957 County Road 864	Princeton	Texas	75407	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/24/23 16:55	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	Hari	Bikkina	6125 horsetail dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/24/23 23:36	Preferred route: D please  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 & entertaining. Noise and traffic from the bypass would certainly impact our family business.  Thank you for considering Route D over route C :)  -Amy Teague	Amy	Teague	1789 County Road 338	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/24/23 23:39	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.	K	B		McKinney	Texas				
2/24/23 23:45	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.	Mike	Glatz	1925 Desoto Dr	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 0:10	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.	Zachary	Hope		McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 0:12	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.	yvonne	Lambeth	7517 Thistledown drive	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 0:43	I am a resident of Stonebridge Ranch I support Plan B. Thank You James Jones	James	Jones	7304 Province St.	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 0:52	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.	Jurgen	Lison	720 Hawk Wood Ln	Prosper		75078	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/25/23 1:15	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.	Stacey	Jacobson	6501 ORCHARD PARK DR	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 2:02	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!	KM	L		McKinney	Texas		[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 3:33	I agree with this option to keep 380 on 380 through prosper	STEPHANI E	ADKINS	771 Manchester Ave	prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 4:49	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.	Sadia	Rahman	1705 Camberton Drive	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 14:16	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.	Diane	Skiff	2021 Lassen Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 14:37	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.					Texas				
2/25/23 14:46	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.	Marc	G		Prosper	Texas	75078			
2/25/23 15:33	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.	Mark	Johnston	8705 Preston Wood Drive	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 15:38	Our family fully supports segment A as the preferred alignment. Thank you for the current EIS recommendation to keep 380 on 380 through Prosper.	Jana	Horowitz	4321 Glacier Point Ct	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 16:06	"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.					Texas				

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	<p>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife.                      7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</p>									
<p>2/25/23 16:09</p>	<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>	<p>Craig</p>	<p>Hansen</p>	<p>2890 Gentle Creek Trail</p>	<p>Prosper</p>	<p>Texas</p>	<p>75078</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>		
<p>2/25/23 16:12</p>	<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.</p>					<p>Texas</p>				

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/25/23 16:15	<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>	Kim	Howell	Rockhill Rd.	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 16:55	<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>McKinney, Tx</p>					Texas				
2/25/23 17:02	<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>	Kalen	Sawyer		Dallas	Texas	75217	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 17:40	<p>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.</p>	Heather	Peoples	6629 Orchard Park Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 17:41	<p>I am very much in favor of the Blue Line option.</p>	vanessa	walls	2761 Clarendon Court	Prosper		75078	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/25/23 18:23	<p>I support the Preferred Alignment (A+E+C) chosen by TxDOT.</p> <p>Two slides captured the specifics very well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Least amount of new ROW</li> <li>* Not displace community facilities</li> <li>* Least impactful on floodplains</li> <li>* Lower potential 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 property</li> <li>* Meets the project purpose and need</li> </ul> <p>TxDOT also acknowledges that Segment B conflicts with the land use and thoroughfare plans of Prosper.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The numerous developments west of Custer should not be needlessly destroyed/impacted by Segment B.</p>	V A	Hansen	190 N Preston	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 19:42	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.	Ann	Miller	2705 Majestic Avenue	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 20:03	Option B is less expensive and safer than Option A. TXDOT should reconsider and implement Segment B.	David	Miller	2705 Majestic Avenue	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 20:05	Option B is less expensive and safer than Option A. TXDOT should reconsider and implement Segment B.	Hannah	Miller	2705 Majestic Avenue	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/25/23 21:44	Attachment	Dave and Stephanie	Johnson	7505 Wescott Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
2/25/23 22:46	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.	Srivatsa	Kandalai			Texas				

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/25/23 23:19	<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>	T	S		Richardson	Texas	75081			
2/26/23 2:25	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	Chayse	Harvard	2113 Tabitha Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/26/23 2:26	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	Chayse	Harvard	2113 Tabitha Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/26/23 3:49	<p>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 4 of the 7 city council and city mayor has influenced them to not push back. Financially, having the least environmental impact, traffic</p>	Clayton	Yonts	2601 Addison St	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	congestion, and the amount of businesses that will be impacted, it all very strongly suggests option B as the best route. A bypass or loop is created to divert the traffic to lesson 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 congestion, which is the opposite reason for creating this!									
2/26/23 4:24	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.	Shannon	Etier	2601 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/26/23 6:40	Oppose segment A	Natalie	McShane	7716 Willowbend Dr	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/26/23 14:45	My comments are in the attached PDF.	Jon	Bolen	2203 State Blvd.	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
2/26/23 15:07	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.	Peter	Lam	2300 stone creek dr.	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/26/23 18:42	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.	Danielle	Kazmierczak	2301 Meadowlark Drive	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/27/23 5:02	"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.	Candice	Odell	4804 Mountain Ridge Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	I know this will be a difficult decision and we would just like to minimize the impact as much as possible.									
2/27/23 5:14	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.	Amber	Yoos	2550 Co Rd 332	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/27/23 17:25	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.	Phillip	Falk	2751 Majestic Avenue	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
2/27/23 19:41	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!	LS		1001 bridgeport In	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
2/28/23 2:39	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	Bradley	Tidwell	2504 Sunnyside Drive	McKinney		75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
2/28/23 3:52	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	James	Nichols	2505 Eclipse Place	Celina	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		
2/28/23 4:04	No to Segment A, Yes to Segment B	Mike	Ambroziak	1505 Pine Hollow Dr	McKinney	Texas	75072	[REDACTED]		
2/28/23 14:47	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.	Dustin	Pearson	2863 Majestic Ave.	McKinney		75071	[REDACTED]		
2/28/23 20:22	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..	Frank	DeLizza, PE	1601 Stratford Pl	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
3/1/23 19:52	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.	Diana	Heald	3983 CR 331	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/1/23 22:00	No to segment A. YES to segment B. As a homeowner, I strongly oppose Segment A.	M	W		McKinney	Texas	75072			
3/2/23 15:30	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.	Erik	Baumgarten	2712 Majestic Ave	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/3/23 1:43	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.	Elena	Rush	7404 Stanhope Street	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/5/23 1:05	<p>Dear Mr Endres,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	P	Bland	Majestic Avenue	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/6/23 20:44	<p>supporting "plan B"</p> <p>It costs \$98.8 million less and has a lesser impact to citizens.</p> <p>Any support for the other plan is a non starter.</p> <p>Why waste \$100 million when plan B is the obvious choice??</p>	Brad	Johnson		McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/6/23 21:12	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Lydia	DSouza	6808 Revere Dr.	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment 1</a> <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> (they are the same)

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/6/23 22:22	<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>	Chris	Self	2312 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/6/23 23:07	<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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	Kim	Himes	2021 Tremont Boulevard	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/6/23 23:40	<p>I am against route A since it cost \$200M + more than route B. B affects fewer homes &amp; 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 &amp; North traveling traffic North/South to 380! A causes more congestion, noise, pollution, costs \$200,000,000+ higher.</p>	Monte	Self	2312 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/7/23 3:06	<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</p>	John	Worrall	7505 Cormac St	McKinney		75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	help a lot of people avoid years of traffic snarls. Thanks for opportunity to comment. I hope these comments are read!									
3/7/23 3:08	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 & 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.	Clint	Kaeding	2408 Addison Street	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/7/23 12:36	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	S	Davenport	7308 Easley Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/7/23 15:52	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.	terry	stephenson	7404 Ardmore St	McKinney		75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	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?									
3/7/23 18:04	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.	Mike	Kohl	2513 Pearl Street	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/7/23 19:04	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>	Paul	Bland	Majestic Avenue	McKinney	Texas	75071			
3/8/23 6:51	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	Lainie	Reed	2700 Clover Ln	Dalworthington Gardens	Texas	76015	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	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.									
3/8/23 17:20	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 approx 5 miles.	Tom	Keenan	4109 Sequoia St	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachments</a>
3/9/23 0:25	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.	Jennifer	Claunch	7012 Allegiance Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/9/23 23:43	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.	Stacy	Weller	7404 Wescott Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/10/23 0:50	<p>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.</p> <p>My home and family will suffer being burdened with this "Super Highway" on two sides. Loud, busy and dirty.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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!</p> <p>Respectfully, Gary, Stacy and Chloe Metzler 7512 Hanover Street Tucker Hill</p>	Gary	Metzler	7512 Hanover St	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/10/23 2:37	<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>	Richard	Hanson	2509 Fitzgerald Ave	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/10/23 2:40	<p>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.</p>	Christopher	Thompson	2009 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/10/23 6:07	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.	Martina	Gistaro	2505 Welty St	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/10/23 14:15	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. 🙏🙏 Thank you, A Webb 2304 Grassmere Lane Mckinney	Angee	Webb	2304 Grassmere lane	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/10/23 16:04	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.					Texas				
3/10/23 18:14	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.	Jonathan	Adams	3209 Timber Ridge Trail	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]	I_could_benefit_monetarily_or_o	

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	<p>6) Section C is strongly opposed by Texas Parks and Wildlife. 7) Section C also has worse traffic performance.</p>									
<p>3/10/23 18:25</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We understand McKinney is growing. We enjoy much of the new growth around us.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Find another way.</p>	<p>Karen</p>	<p>Denton</p>	<p>6609 Valley View Dr</p>	<p>McKinney</p>	<p>Texas</p>	<p>75071</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>		
<p>3/10/23 19:48</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Alex</p>	<p>Milano</p>	<p>2604 Addison St</p>	<p>Mckinney</p>	<p>Texas</p>	<p>75071</p>			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/10/23 19:56	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.	Kim	Milano	2604 Addison St	McKinney	Texas	75071			
3/11/23 18:46	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!	Mildred	Salas		McKinney	Texas	75071			
3/12/23 22:38	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.	Peter	Stuckmann	8000 Castine Drive	Mckinney	Texas	75071	I_could_benefit_monetarily_or_o		<a href="#">Attachmen t</a>
3/12/23 23:36	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 Leslie Allcorn 7312 Ripley St	Leslie	Allcorn	7312 Ripley St	McKinney	Texas	75071			
3/13/23 1:36	Attachment	Ellen	Landel	2105 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071			<a href="#">Attachmen t</a>

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/13/23 4:02	<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.</p> <p>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>	Cathy	Garrett		McKinney	Texas	75071			
3/14/23 20:24	<p>Mr. Endres, 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 usd 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>	Samuel C	De Leon Caballero	6421 Falcon Ridge Ln	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/14/23 20:56	<p>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</p>	Dale	Hoenshell	7433 Ardmore St	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	growth while splitting the disruption to a small area of Prosper and McKinney.									
3/14/23 22:52	<p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Alejandra Quiroga De De Leon 6421 Falcon Ridge Ln McKinney, TX, 75071</p>	Alejandra	Quiroga De De Leon	6421 Falcon Ridge Ln	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/14/23 22:54	<p>NO to Segment A</p> <p>Mr. Endres,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Alejandra Quiroga De De Leon 6421 Falcon Ridge Ln McKinney, TX, 75071</p>	Alejandra	Quiroga De De Leon	6421 Falcon Ridge Ln	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/15/23 0:16	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.	Brandon	Rojas	601 Lake Livingston Trl	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/15/23 1:09	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.	L	R	2523 Lakeside Dr.	McKinney	Texas	75071			

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/15/23 11:57	Comment uploaded	Mike	Skorz	5900 Augustine Rd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
	<p>I DO NOT support the current TxDot decision</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Only one entrance - how will this be safe with an 8 lane freeway in front of this entrance?</p> <p>380 bypass is more expensive</p>									
3/15/23 13:46	There are other options - this is a VERY poor choice	Carol	Ownby	7600 Hanover Street	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/15/23 14:03	Attachment	Tara	Lenney	7504 HANOVER ST	MCKINNEY	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
3/15/23 14:03	Attachment	Steven	Lenney	7504 HANOVER ST	MCKINNEY	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
3/15/23 15:03	<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!!</p> <p>Findings of the Environmental Impact Study should have led to selection of Segment B.</p> <p>No businesses displaced, rather than 15 current businesses displaced in Segment A.</p> <p>2 rather than 7 major utility conflicts in Segment A</p> <p>No hazardous material sites impacted, rather 2 in Segment A.</p> <p>Nearly twice the impact to rivers and streams; ½ mile vs. 1 mile</p> <p>Segment A impacts more than 30 irreplaceable Heritage trees, aged over 150 years.</p> <p>Segment B saves over \$150 million dollars for Collin County Taxpayers vs. Segment A</p> <p>\$153M in right of way costs, rather than \$198M in Segment A.</p> <p>\$25M in utility relocation costs, rather than \$75 in Segment A.</p> <p>\$588M in design and construction costs rather than \$608M in Segment</p>	Clay	Yonts	2601 Addison St.	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	A. \$40M savings in utility relocation for the City of McKinney.									
3/15/23 16:22	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Nam Quan	Nguyen	7200 Ripley Street	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/15/23 17:00	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.	Tim	Himes	2021 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/15/23 17:10	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.	James	Martin	4280 Wilson Creek Trail	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/15/23 17:48	Dear TXDOT... 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.	T	Pennington	420 Whitley Place Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/15/23 18:20	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	Logan	Schultz	5024 White Spruce Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/15/23 21:05	agree with the proposed plan— keep 380 on 380 in Prosper, Texas	JC	Diaz	4040 Teton Place	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/15/23 21:43	I oppose Route C of the 380 Bypass in North Texas.	L	P			Texas				
3/15/23 22:36	Hi! I do not support section E and would instead prefer the existing 380 section F.	Kimm	Sinho	4400 Knollview dr	Plano	Texas	75024	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/15/23 22:57	<p>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!</p> <p>Kenneth E. Seguin Colonel (Retired), USAF</p> <p>Immediate Past President Whitley Place HOA Prosper, TX</p>	Kenneth	Seguin	320 Yosemite Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/16/23 13:45	<p>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.</p>	M	Strommer	1001 Cliff Creek Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/16/23 15:28	<p>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.</p>	Frank	Etier	2601 Tremont Blvd	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/17/23 0:49	<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>	Rob	Stogsdill	3750 Dogwood Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/17/23 1:01	<p>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.</p>	Nancy	Stogsdill	3750 Dogwood	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/18/23 18:24	<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>	Brad	Davis	1065 Chambersville Road	Weston	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/18/23 21:15	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. Segment C also destroys and disrupts a couple of communities along FM 2933. Segment D in comparison affects one community on Woodlawn Road and does not put neighbors on opposite sides of the freeway. If Segment D were moved just a few hundred feet to the east it could avoid destroying any homes along Woodlawn Road. Without modification Segment D has far fewer disruptions and displacements of both residences and businesses. I oppose Segment C. I support Segment D with a preference for a modified Segment D to avoid displacing residences along Woodlawn Road (unless that community would prefer it unmodified). -Paul Borchard	Paul	Borchard	P.O. Box 354	McKinney	Texas	75070	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment (combined)</a>
3/18/23 21:55	Attachment	Mary	Borchard	2161 Borchard TRL	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
3/19/23 6:18	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	George E and Barbara A	Dupont	1400 Harvest Ridge Lane	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/19/23 20:40	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	Janet	Magana	7501 Townsend Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/19/23 20:44	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	Chris	Price	901 Avian Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/19/23 20:45	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	Chris	Price	901 Avian Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/19/23 21:44	No to segment A, yes to B.	David	S			Texas				
3/19/23 22:13	I want to voice my support, again, for Route A. 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) 3) Results in the least number of noise receptors 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 A route as recommended by TXDOT's own EIS study.	Amy	Roller	521 Whitley Place Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/20/23 5:33	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.	Dmitry	Savy	4201 Pine Needle Court	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/20/23 16:47	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	Daniel	Konieczny	7400 Townsend Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/20/23 17:08	Attachment	Andrew	McCaffrey	3440 Spicewood Drive	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
3/20/23 18:26	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.	G	Nguyen	7200 Ripley St	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/21/23 2:16	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.	Randy	Shaver	805 Eagle Ridge Ct	MCKINNEY	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/21/23 13:28	<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 an 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 it's needed. We have tried to take this whole process in stride, but it's 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.</p> <p>John Gidney</p>	John	Gidney	7105 Winstanley lane	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
3/22/23 1:48	<p>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.</p>	Kyle	Voigt	2321 Tremont Boulevard	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/22/23 14:41	<p>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.</p> <p>Douglas Mousel [REDACTED]</p>	Douglas	Mousel	5850 Granite Parkway, Suite 100	Plano	Texas	75024	[REDACTED]		
3/23/23 4:15	<p>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.</p>	Lorraine	Bland		Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/23/23 15:37	<p>To Mr. Stephen Endres and those it concerns,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please Do The Right Thing! Finalize Segment A as the final decision, close discussions and let's all move forward.</p> <p>Respectfully, Steven Clay</p>	S	C	4120 Chimney Rock Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/23/23 15:42	<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.</p> <p>Finalize Segment A as the final decision, close discussions and let's all move forward.</p> <p>Respectfully, Dream Street Developers, LLC.</p>	D	S	2001 Central Cir	McKinney	Texas	75069	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/24/23 15:08	<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>	Angela	Moss	3831 Glacier Point Ct	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
3/26/23 15:55	<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>	Richard	Crookston	3212 Marginal Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/26/23 16:11	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	Rebecca	Crookston	3212 Marginal Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/26/23 17:54	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 to 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.					Texas			I_could_benefit_monetarily_or_o	
3/27/23 18:36	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.	Sara	Austin		Prosper	Texas				
3/27/23 21:08	Dear Mr Endres 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.	Diane	Reynolds	7416 Ardmore St	Mckinney	Texas	75071	████████████████████		
3/27/23 23:43	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!	Diane	Reynolds	7416 Ardmore St	Mckinney	Texas	75071	████████████████████		
3/28/23 17:18	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 & Custer, impact to existing neighborhoods vs undeveloped land, utility complications,). At some	Cathy	Garrett	7313 Darrow Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	████████████████████		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	point, the "popularity" & public campaign of ManeGait HAS to be set aside and facts need to be the deciding factors. Segment B makes sense!!									
3/28/23 17:19	<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.</p> <p>However, IF a 380 bypass is to be developed the choice is clear ... Segment B!</p> <p>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>	Cathy	Garrett	7313 Darrow Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/29/23 4:21	<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.</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>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>	Cathy	Garrett	7413 Darrow Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/29/23 4:29	<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.</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>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>	Cathy	Garrett	7413 Darrow Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/29/23 14:33	<p>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?</p>	Leena	Mirza		McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
3/29/23 15:48	<p>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>	Michel	Moffatt	3225 Sky Lane	Celina	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		
3/29/23 16:17	<p>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>	Ashley	Pepkin	2628 Seabiscuit Rd	Celina	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		
3/29/23 16:49	<p>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>	Blake	Hunter	2801 Seabiscuit Rd	Celina	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		
3/29/23 17:09	<p>Oppose Segment B</p>	Stephanie	McGary	2514 War Admiral St	Celina	Texas	75009		I_do_business_with_TxDOT.	
3/29/23 17:48	<p>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.</p>	Srinivas	Amaram			Texas		[REDACTED]		
3/29/23 19:30	<p>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.</p>	M	D	3051 Seattle Slew Drive	Celina	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/29/23 19:42	What happened with 380 staying on 380? I think the proposal is not great for the envoy and would increase polution in residential areas					Texas				
3/29/23 19:52	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 expanse 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.	Kimberly	Kenia		McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		
3/29/23 21:08	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.	Shannon	E	2601 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		
3/29/23 21:20	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 utilitiesCosts is lessMinimizes 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	Robert	Clough	7312 Easley Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		
3/29/23 23:36	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.).	K	L		Celina	Texas				
3/30/23 8:03	Strong opposition to proposed expansion of Highway 380 near Bloomridge, community where I live. Mother of autistic toddler, especially concerned about the risks & disruptions this will cause to our community, its negative impacts on our quality of life, health, every day activities & home values. Segment A will wrap around Bloomridge in close proximity to our homes impacting two entrances & putting our families at risk. The resulting noise & air pollution will be devastating & detrimental to my child's health & 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.	Judy	A	5913 Bellflower Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	I urge you to reconsider this plan & 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 & chaos from the huge highway coming at our doorsteps.									
3/30/23 13:45	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 by-pass, take the land from McKinney.	Judy	Strawmyer	3023 Seattle Slew Dr.	Celina	Texas	75009	██████████		
3/30/23 15:31	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.	Katelyn	Bogenschutz	6020 aster drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		
3/30/23 17:37	As a 6yr resident of McKinney, chosing 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.	Joshua	Roberts	8104 Saint Clair Drive	Mckinney	Texas	75071	██████████		
3/30/23 17:45	As a 6yr resident of McKinney, chosing 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	Catherine	Roberts	8104 Saint Clair Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	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.									
3/30/23 20:11	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.	Brendan	Bogenschutz		McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		
3/30/23 23:05	<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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>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>	A	T	2800 Bucer	McKinney	Texas	75234	██████████		
3/31/23 3:21	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.	Darryl	Jackson	5816 Crawley Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		
3/31/23 3:22	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 pollution, and more accidents. Both choices will negatively impact people. My understanding is B is less expensive than A. That savings can and should be used to depress the roadway and take whatever action you can to reduce noise.	Larry	Truesdale	8009 Saint Clair Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	██████████		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
3/31/23 5:10	<p>As a resident of Tucker Hill, I oppose route A and support Route B.</p> <p>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 to the East and limited access to the South - with additional noise impacts from that direction as well.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	H	H	7408 Stanhope Street	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/1/23 3:17	<p>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</p>	kevin	maldonado	2908 country church	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/2/23 17:57	<p>Your selection of Segment A is a decision not supported by the facts. I am opposed to Segment A and support Segment B.</p> <p>Three of the four reasons given to support the decision to select Segment C are:</p> <p>Impacts fewer utilities</p> <p>Costs is less</p> <p>Minimizes impact to floodplains and flood ways.</p> <p>Applying this same criteria to A vs B would conclude B is preferred.</p> <p>Looks like the criteria was selected to support the conclusion you wanted not an impartial decision based on the facts.</p>	Linda	Clough	7312 Easley Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/3/23 6:27	<p>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.</p>	Doug	Ashby	2762 MAJESTIC AVE	MCKINNEY	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	Thank you, Doug Ashby									
4/3/23 13:22	<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.</p> <p>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>.</p> <p>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.)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The measurement used by TxDOT is outdated (last updated in 2001) and has known unreliability</p>	Dallas	Taylor	2116 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/3/23 14:01	I believe better or improved access needs to 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!	Michael	Gonzalez	2467 County Road 1084	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/3/23 14:03	I believe better or improved access needs to 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!	Michael	Gonzalez	2467 County Road 1084	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/3/23 14:04	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.	Kevin	Baumgarte n	2489 County Road 1084	mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
4/3/23 14:06	<p>I oppose segment C as drawn.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	Jorja	Baumgarten	2489 County Road 1084	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/3/23 14:08	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.	Dennis	Duffin	3123 Stickhorse Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/3/23 14:20	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Nicholas	Nordman	4221 Bellingrath Dr	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
4/3/23 16:33	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.	Donald	Sams	3343 Stickhorse Ln	Mckinney	Texas	75071			
4/3/23 20:53	Attachment	Mary	Baumgarten	700 Mayberry Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/3/23 20:54	Attachment	Harry	Baumgarten	700 Mayberry Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/4/23 4:43	Please reconsider Option B. It is less expensive, less disruptive, less complex option. I have attached additional comments about the justifications below.	Jon	DeShazo	2204 State Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/4/23 20:28	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!	Liang	Chen	1100 Hoyt Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
4/4/23 21:28	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>	Liang	Chen	1100 Hoyt Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/4/23 21:33	<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>	Hong	Yun	5517 Port Vale Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/4/23 22:57	<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>	Liang	Chen	1100 Hoyt Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a> <a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/5/23 1:10	<p>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.</p>	Mark & Caren	Wilson	3B Rhea Mills Cir	Prosper	Texas	75078	[REDACTED]		
4/5/23 1:14	<p>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.</p>	Prd	D	5408 Grove Cove dr	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/5/23 14:54	<p>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.</p> <p>It seems as if TxDOT is giving more consideration to the plans of Prosper</p>	Ron	Alderman	8337 Parish Ave	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
	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.									
4/5/23 19:04	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.	J	Claunch	7012 Allegiance Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/5/23 19:11	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.	Cheryl	Papciak-Brooks	812 Cowan Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/5/23 22:53	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.	N	H	3800 Wittenburg Dr	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/12/23 14:41	I moved to Tucker Hill Mckinney 4 1/2 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.	Mary Beth	Piper	7701 Townsend Blvd	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
4/14/23 0:15	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.	Kurt	Wiest	2409 Bucer Court	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/18/23 2:41	A,E,C if we must.  With SRT widening and the Outer Loop, this will likely not be as needed in the future.	Ed	Thompson			Texas		[REDACTED]		
4/18/23 19:18	Attachment	Robert	Clough	7312 Easley Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/18/23 19:20	Attachment	Linda	Clough	7312 Easley Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/19/23 8:12	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.	W	W	2815 Majestic Prince St	Celina	Texas	75009	[REDACTED]		
4/19/23 21:48	Please see the attached letter.	David	Keese	7201 Darrow Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/20/23 2:36	Please see uploaded document for comments.	Rachel	T	2009 Tremont Blvd	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]	I_could_benefit_monetarily_or_o	<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/20/23 2:43	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.	William	Harrell	7200 w university	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/20/23 3:33	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?	Clay	Yonts	2601 Addison St.	Mckinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>

Creation Date	Please enter your comments here.	First Name	Last Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email Address	Please select each of the following that apply to you (Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)).	Links
4/20/23 4:52	Attachment	Peggy	Djurdjulov	2320 Grassmere Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/20/23 15:37	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 a quiet life here, interacting with neighbors in our front porch community.	June	Poe	2300 Grassmere Lane	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/20/23 16:34	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.	Dan	Tobin	8111 Preston Road, Suite 750	Dallas	Texas	75225	[REDACTED]		
4/20/23 17:58	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!	Sarah	Reyna	3300 Wind Flower Lane	McKinney	Texas	75070	[REDACTED]		
4/20/23 21:08	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	Rick	Franklin	7621 Darrow Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		
4/21/23 2:21	My Comment regarding the decisions to elect Segment A over Segment B is attached.	Jennifer Anne	Cheek	7313 Darrow Drive	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>
4/21/23 2:46	Attachment	Tony	Ghaffarian	7313 Darrow Dr	McKinney	Texas	75071	[REDACTED]		<a href="#">Attachment</a>