



Non-Radioactive Hazardous Materials Route Designation Study



Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

1. What does the risk factor value indicate?

The risk factor is a comparative value showing the relative risk of having an NRHM cargo vehicle travel along the route. The lower the risk factor, the safer the route.

2. What factors influenced the risk minimized routing scenarios?

Routing in these scenarios is based on minimizing risk, which is a measure of crash probability and potential population exposure. Roadway design, regional connectivity, and current shipping patterns are also factors that are considered. The current focus of the route designation is through-routing.

3. Why is there is a gap on SH 71 (between SH 130 and I-35) in the risk minimized routing?

In general, if we consider only the risk associated with this portion of the candidate network, it has a greater risk than alternative routing options. As the study progresses, there will be opportunities to modify the routing based on other factors to make it more logical and continuous.

4. Why doesn't US 183 show up in the routing?

Similar to the SH 71 example, US 183 is not included as a draft routing option because the calculated risk for this roadway is greater than alternative options. The analysis shows that this roadway runs through areas with high population and employment density.

5. What does the travel time value indicate?

The travel time value indicates the total travel time in minutes across the network connecting major study area entry and exit points. The value can help show whether using the risk minimized routes causes unreasonable delay. The lower the value, the faster the route.

6. What is the minimized travel time scenario showing?

This scenario shows the shortest travel time for trips between major entry/exit points in the study area. Through our analysis, we have identified these routing options as current common through-routes for NRHM cargo, and we are using them as a comparison for NRHM routing alternatives.

7. Why is Loop 1 /Mopac included in the risk minimized routing excluding toll roads?

This route was selected because the risk along this roadway is low when compared to other alternatives for travelling through Central Austin. Although Mopac bisects populated areas, Central Austin has few North-South through-routing options to choose from. Alternatives include I-35 and US 183. According to the risk analysis, Mopac is less risky to populations than these alternatives, though it only becomes a preferred route in scenarios that do not include toll roads as options.



Non-Radioactive Hazardous Materials Route Designation Study



Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

8. What are your next steps following the Feb. 21st Open House #2?

Next steps will include incorporating public feedback, finalizing the risk analysis, conducting additional factors analysis, notifying area political subdivisions (i.e. local governments) of the study findings to date, finalizing draft recommended routes, holding a public hearing, submitting routes to TxDOT for approval, and developing a signage plan. After routes are approved, the City will have to place the signs and enact an ordinance enforcing the route designation.

9. How are you incorporating public feedback?

The project team is compiling all public comments and reporting them to the Steering Committee for review and consideration. Issues identified through public comment are also brought to the Stakeholder Working Group for review and discussion.

10. What are the remaining public engagement opportunities?

Future public engagement opportunities will include, at minimum: a public meeting later this Spring, opportunities to provide input through an online forum, and an official public hearing and comment period.