

PUBLIC COMMENTS REPORT
WRITTEN COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY WEBSITE, EMAIL & SOCIAL MEDIA

Purpose

The public comments report is in accordance with the NCTCOG Transportation Department Public Participation Plan, which became effective June 1, 1994, as approved by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the transportation policy board for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and updated on Oct. 9, 2025.

This document is a compilation of public comments related to various transportation and air quality initiatives that were submitted from Thursday, Feb. 20 through Wednesday, March 19, 2026 via website, email, social media and in person at NCTCOG's monthly Regional Transportation Council (RTC) meeting.

Additionally, comments can be submitted through Map Your Experience, the Transportation Department's online mapping tool. This tool allows users to drop a pin on a location in the region and leave a detailed comment. The tool received **10** new comments related to bicycles, pedestrians, roadway and transit conditions. You can view these new comments as well as past comments by visiting

<https://geospatial.nctcog.org/portal/apps/CrowdsourceReporter/index.html?appid=b014e6d39b604b3ca329d9094ed1e9e2>.

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Sustainable Development

Facebook –

1. As our #TopicOfTheMonth series on sustainable development continues, we're highlighting projects that have transformed communities, like Fort Worth's South Main Urban Village Project. Supported through the NCTCOG Sustainable Development Program, this corridor revitalization added pedestrian amenities and streetscape improvements that helped transform the area into a more walkable, mixed-use destination.

Read more about Fort Worth's South Main Urban Village Project at the link in our comments below! - NCTCOG Transportation Department



It would be stellar if the Heartland Flyer got one more year of support, and some assistance rendered to Denton County Transit and D.A.R.T to extend the A Train to Downtown Carrollton quickly and efficiently - Matthew Banks

Transit

Facebook –

1. As we wrap up February's #TopicOfTheMonth, we're looking ahead at the future of intercity rail. Planning efforts for the high-speed rail network and I-20 Corridor could expand long-distance passenger rail options, addressing the region's growing transportation needs and improving mobility across North Texas.

Learn more about the future of intercity rail at the link in our comments below! - NCTCOG Transportation Department



From the outfit that chooses to office in a city, Arlington, with no public transit, so it's easy to say; "Do as we say, not as we do." - Rob Dentremont

No more highway lanes, more trains! - Curtis Garrison

2. Another sneak peek at our upcoming video of our staff taking the Amtrak Heartland Flyer to Oklahoma City! Full video drops next week! - NCTCOG Transportation Department



Can't wait! - Amtrak

Instagram –

1. As we wrap up February’s #TopicOfTheMonth, we’re looking ahead at the future of intercity rail. Planning efforts for the high-speed rail network and I-20 Corridor could expand long-distance passenger rail options, addressing the region’s growing transportation needs and improving mobility across North Texas.

Learn more about the future of intercity rail at the link in our comments below! - NCTCOG Transportation Department



Yes please! – Anzadeh

Letters -

1. Please see Attachment 1 for comments submitted via letter.

Roadways

Email -

Jesse Payten and Deborah Franklin Payten, Citizens

1. Our neighborhood, Parks of Deer Creek along McPherson Boulevard, currently has only one way in and out, directly off I-35W. With TxDOT moving forward on plans to widen and reconstruct I-35W, I am extremely concerned about losing safe and reliable access to my home during construction.

My household consists of senior citizens and caregivers for a 93-year-old family member, and we also have grandchildren who visit from time to time. Because of this, reliable and timely access in and out of the neighborhood is essential. In the event of a medical emergency, emergency responders must be able to reach our home quickly, and we must be able to exit the neighborhood without delay to access urgent medical care. A single access point that is heavily impacted by construction-related traffic, delays, or closures creates a serious safety risk for my household.

Additionally, our neighborhood has limited travel paths and no direct access to metro or city public transportation. Family members, caregivers, and medical providers must be able to reach our home without navigating excessive congestion or unsafe conditions. The lack of alternate routes already makes access challenging and will be significantly worsened during the I-35W construction project.

I am requesting that the segment from I-35W to North Crowley Road be funded and constructed on an accelerated schedule and coordinated with TxDOT's I-35W project so that residents are not left with only one construction-impacted access point for an extended period of time.

This is a matter of public safety, emergency access, and household security, and I respectfully request serious and immediate consideration of this issue to ensure continued, safe access to our homes throughout the duration of construction.

Response by NCTCOG Transportation Staff

Ms. Payten,

Thank you for your patience while we coordinated internally on the best point of contact for your concerns.

Mohammad Alhweil (mohammad.alhweil@txdot.gov) and Micheal Haithcock (michael.haithcock@txdot.gov) at TxDOT should have more information on construction timing and potential closures. Reaching out to them will help bring this issue to their attention.

Additionally, it may be helpful to copy Kelly Porter with the City of Fort Worth on the email (Kelly.porter@fortworthtexas.gov), regarding the extension of McPherson Road.

The McPherson Extension is included in our Mobility 2050 plan after the year 2040 and exists from IH 35W over to McCart Avenue.

Good morning, Ms. Payten

I wanted to provide a bit of clarification on my response email yesterday. McPherson Road doesn't currently extend to McCart Avenue, but this extension is planned for the future, as it's included in our long-range transportation plan, Mobility 2050.

Apologies for any confusion.

Mike Holland, Citizen

2. Hello, My Town has received a rezoning request for development of a shopping center. We are a small town of 3100 residents and we have limited resources. The Development company is using a NCTCOG model for traffic analysis. I have attached some of the information that has been presented to us. I would like to understand the information and am hoping that someone at NCTCOG can assist me. Thank you (Please see Attachment 2)

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
2300 N. Field Street
Suite 1800
Dallas, TX 75201

T +1 214.969.2800
F +1 214.969.4343
akingump.com

The logo for the law firm Akin, consisting of the word "Akin" in a bold, blue, sans-serif font.

ERIC GAMBRELL
214.969.2799/214.969.4343
egambrell@akingump.com

February 23, 2026

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
North Central Texas Council of Governments
616 Six Flags Drive
Arlington, Texas 76011

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

As you know, I represent Hunt Realty Investments, Hunt Consolidated, Inc., Ray L. Hunt and certain other affiliated and/or related entities (collectively, "Hunt").

A recent letter sent by the City of Arlington's City Manager Trey Yelverton to, among others, North Central Texas Council of Government's ("NCTCOG") Transportation Director Michael Morris affirmatively represents, *inter alia*:

"Arlington strongly supports the development of high-speed transportation between Fort Worth, Arlington, and Dallas"

"To that end, the City of Arlington reaffirms its intent to participate financially in this project once state and federal clearances are secured and a viable, approved business plan is in place."

"The City of Arlington respectfully proposes initiating exploratory discussions around the creation of a technology-based transit agency under the leadership of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) and the Transit 2.0 Subcommittee."

See January 22, 2026 Letter from Arlington City Manager Trey Yelverton (the "Yelverton Letter"), attached as Electronic Item 4.1 to Regional Transportation Council February 12, 2026 Agenda Packet.

As a courtesy, I provide you the below information that, among other evidence, calls into immediate question the express representations made in the Yelverton Letter, including the "support" and "intent" of Arlington as alleged.

Any review of recorded public meetings of the Arlington City Council reveals that there was no vote, much less any consideration, by the Arlington City Council regarding its position on the proclamations in the Yelverton Letter, much less the authority to send the Yelverton Letter. As disturbing proof, a member of the Arlington City Council actually stated on the record during an Arlington City Council meeting that she first heard about the Yelverton Letter from a media story weeks after the letter had been delivered to Mr. Morris.

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
February 23, 2026
Page 2

Bluntly, the *alleged* “intent, “support,” and/or “proposal” of the City of Arlington purported in the Yelverton Letter did not emanate from the Arlington City Council, the actual governing body of that municipality. Beyond the fact that the Yelverton Letter was not an authorized statement of the Arlington City Council, it cannot be ignored that at least one member of the Arlington City Council recently made unequivocally clear his negative position that “Arlington is never going to participate in Trinity Metro or DART at a cent *or* half-cent level.” *See* November 25, 2025 City of Arlington City Council Meeting.

The allegation in the Yelverton Letter that “Arlington” “supports” joining a “transit agency” also cannot reasonably or credibly be attributed to the people who actually live in Arlington. As you are acutely aware, Arlington voters have consistently – no less than three (3) straight times – affirmatively voted that down at the ballot box.

It also cannot be left aside that it is *Michael Morris* who has admitted that Arlington’s *lack* of support and refusal to “join[] one of the existing transit agencies” prohibits any “stop” in the Arlington Entertainment District relating to possible future Dallas-to-Fort Worth higher-speed rail. Morris has even equated Arlington’s longtime status a “non-subscriber” (by thrice voting down participation in a transit agency as noted above) as not being a “partner with the rest of the [transportation] system” in North Texas.

Even if the Yelverton Letter had been sent with any authority of (or even consideration by) the Arlington City Council and even if there was the required “support” by the citizenry of Arlington to vote in a required election to join a transit agency after all these decades firmly opposing it, the representation of purported “support” carries a lengthy list of conditions that are legally, commercially, and practically impossible and will never occur.

For example, the Yelverton Letter sent by Arlington’s City Manager to Mr. Morris concedes Arlington has no “intent” to provide any financial support to a transit agency relating to “high-speed transportation” *unless and until* “state and federal clearances are secured and a viable, approved business plan is in place.” Of course, as we have made irrefutably plain in prior correspondence to you, the so-called alignment “2(b)” for possible future Dallas-to-Arlington Entertainment District-to-Fort Worth higher-speed rail is, on myriad bases, legally precluded and impossible and cannot and will not ever be lawfully approved. Even beyond that, there can be no rationally economically viable private business plan or model for this bureaucratically bungled and economically nonsensical route, which *both* the federal government and the State of Texas have repeatedly made clear that it will not be publicly subsidized by the taxpayers.

Perhaps most disconcerting and disappointing, public statements at the February 10, 2026 meeting of the Arlington City Council accuse Michael Morris as being a prodding instigator of the Yelverton Letter. More specifically, a member of the Arlington City Council specifically stated in a video-transcribed statement that the Yelverton Letter was “the letter [Michael Morris] asked for” – even adding that Michael Morris “kept asking when’s that letter coming.” This, of course, connotes that the source of the supposed but illusory Arlington “support” and “intent” emanated or was at least urged on by Michael Morris.

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
February 23, 2026
Page 3

NCTCOG has a binary choice regarding alignment “2(b)”:

- (1) NCTCOG can divert and subsequently waste one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) to fund conjectural legal expenses responding to letters discussing the problems with alignment “2(b)”

or
- (2) NCTCOG can make the FTA aware of its own conclusion that alignment “2(b)” is “fatally flawed,” not “possible,” and therefore ineligible for and withdrawn from future consideration as part of any NEPA application process – which action would moot any future letters regarding alignment “2(b).”

Further, I once again bring to your attention (as they may possibly relate to future NCTCOG considerations) the following facts:

The so-called “Alignment 2(b)” would undeniably threaten, irreparably harm and severely damage the Reunion development as well as the potential for new economic activity adjacent to Dallas’ new \$3 billion Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center.

“Alignment 2(b),” would contravene and interfere with the City’s and Hunt’s legal and lawful rights under their Reunion Master Agreement – in place since 1975.

NCTCOG’s continued action involving the so-called “Alignment 2(b)” is in defiance and disregard of the Resolutions passed unanimously by the City Council of the City of Dallas on, respectively, June 12, 2024 and January 21, 2026.

Please professionally confirm your receipt of this letter and compliance with its demands.

Sincerely,

/s/ Eric Gambrell

Eric Gambrell

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
2300 N. Field Street
Suite 1800
Dallas, TX 75201

T +1 214.969.2800
F +1 214.969.4343
akingump.com

The logo for the law firm Akin, consisting of the word "Akin" in a bold, serif font.

ERIC GAMBRELL
214.969.2799/214.969.4343
egambrell@akingump.com

March 2, 2026

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
North Central Texas Council of Governments
616 Six Flags Drive
Arlington, Texas 76011

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

As you know, I represent Hunt Realty Investments, Hunt Consolidated, Inc., Ray L. Hunt and certain other affiliated and/or related entities (collectively, "Hunt").

We have previously provided you a quote from Michael Morris, as Transportation Director of the North Central Council of Governments ("NCTCOG") regarding the threatening pressure on the Texas electric grid that would result from, *inter alia*, the so-called alignment "2(b)" regarding possible future Dallas-to-Arlington Entertainment District-to-Fort Worth higher-speed rail. More specifically, Mr. Morris has publicly warned: "I am probably hurting the electric grid by advocating high-speed rail." See Michael Morris, Digital Roundtable (September 18, 2024)

As an update on this issue critical to the daily life and safety of Texans, we point your attention to an example of the refrain of recent media reports warning of the harmful burden and drain on the electric grid caused by high-speed rail. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/article/high-speed-rail-line-would-demand-big-slice-of-energy-grids-already-under-pressure/>. It is reported that *each of* the necessary electrical substations would require enough electricity to power an entire town. *Id.* Perspectively, the legally stale six (6) year-old environmental impact statement relating to possible future Dallas-to-Houston high-speed rail (the "EIS") states that fourteen (14) substations would be required for that route – and thus would siphon away from Texas' electric grid the energy necessary to power 14 Texas towns.

That same EIS further disqualifies itself as outdated and not useful by relying on aged information and reports, including a 2014 study to estimate future energy use by Texans. See https://railroads.dot.gov/sites/fra.dot.gov/files/2020-05/01%20DHHSR%20FEIS%20Main%20Text_Set%201%20of%202.pdf. Like other data, analyses, and studies in the old and unusable EIS (including as we have already pointed out to you), relying on 12-year old energy use data is obviously completely unhelpful and irrelevant in the wake of the dynamic Texas economy.

Of course, and as you would readily accede, the proximate result of a strained grid breaching capacity resulting from high-speed rail would be power shortages and blackouts endured by the voting citizens of the State of Texas.

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
March 2, 2026
Page 2

NCTCOG has a binary choice regarding alignment “2(b)”:

- (1) NCTCOG can divert and subsequently waste one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) to fund conjectural legal expenses responding to letters discussing the problems with alignment “2(b)”

or
- (2) NCTCOG can make the FTA aware of its own conclusion that alignment “2(b)” is “fatally flawed,” not “possible,” and therefore ineligible for and withdrawn from future consideration as part of any NEPA application process – which action would moot any future letters regarding alignment “2(b).”

Further, I once again bring to your attention (as they may possibly relate to future NCTCOG considerations) the following facts:

The so-called “Alignment 2(b)” would undeniably threaten, irreparably harm and severely damage the Reunion development as well as the potential for new economic activity adjacent to Dallas’ new \$3 billion Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center.

“Alignment 2(b),” would contravene and interfere with the City’s and Hunt’s legal and lawful rights under their Reunion Master Agreement – in place since 1975.

NCTCOG’s continued action involving the so-called “Alignment 2(b)” is in defiance and disregard of the Resolutions passed unanimously by the City Council of the City of Dallas on, respectively, June 12, 2024 and January 21, 2026.

Please professionally confirm your receipt of this letter and compliance with its demands.

Sincerely,

/s/ Eric Gambrell

Eric Gambrell

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
2300 N. Field Street
Suite 1800
Dallas, TX 75201

T +1 214.969.2800
F +1 214.969.4343
akingump.com

The logo for the law firm Akin, consisting of the word "Akin" in a bold, black, sans-serif font.

ERIC GAMBRELL
214.969.2799/214.969.4343
egambrell@akingump.com

March 9, 2026

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
North Central Texas Council of Governments
616 Six Flags Drive
Arlington, Texas 76011

Re: Houston – Galveston Area Council of Governments has Rejected Taxpayer Funding for High-Speed Rail, further barring the already legally bungled Corridor ID Project

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

As you know, I represent Hunt Realty Investments, Hunt Consolidated, Inc., Ray L. Hunt and certain other affiliated and/or related entities (collectively, “Hunt”).

Michael Morris is the Transportation Director of the North Central Texas Council of Governments (the “NCTCOG”), whose jurisdiction is legally limited to a certain 16 counties in the vicinity of Dallas, Texas, the hub of the North Texas region. Notwithstanding this geographically limited jurisdiction, Mr. Morris has persisted in advocating to the Regional Transportation Council (the “RTC”) to control and influence transportation policy for Houston, Texas – including against South Texas’ own regional transportation bodies’ stated intent.

More specifically, Mr. Morris has pushed for the use of taxpayer subsidies to conduct Step 1 Corridor Identification and Development (“Corridor ID”) work relating to possible future Fort Worth to Houston high-speed rail. But, the Houston equivalent of NCTCOG, the Houston-Galveston Area Council of Governments (“H-GAC”) and its policy committee, the H-GAC Transportation Policy Committee, have vigorously voiced their opposition to the use of public taxpayer funding for high-speed rail in Houston.

For example, at the last meeting of the H-GAC Transportation Policy Committee that discussed high-speed rail, a Member pointed out that “we didn’t want to use taxpayer dollars on this.” A member also pointed out that the Memorandum of Understanding between Texas Central and H-GAC made it “real clear” that the high-speed rail project would “not accept public federal or state grants” “from federal or state governments or through H-GAC.”

The Memorandum of Understanding referred to in the H-GAC Transportation Policy Committee meeting specifically states that Texas Central will “[n]ot accept public federal or state grants from federal, state governments or through H-GAC for its planned North Texas to Greater Houston service.” An H-GAC Transportation Policy Committee member indented that “[o]ur memorandum [of understanding] says we won’t do that.”

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
March 9, 2026
Page 2

The use of federal grant dollars by the RTC regarding potential future high-speed rail to Houston is directly contrary to the will of the regional transportation bodies with actual jurisdiction over the Houston region and a usurpation of their statutorily-granted geographic authority.

NCTCOG has a binary choice regarding alignment “2(b)”:

- (1) NCTCOG can divert and subsequently waste one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) to fund conjectural legal expenses responding to letters discussing the problems with alignment “2(b)”

or
- (2) NCTCOG can make the FTA aware of its own conclusion that alignment “2(b)” is “fatally flawed,” not “possible,” and therefore ineligible for and withdrawn from future consideration as part of any NEPA application process – which action would moot any future letters regarding alignment “2(b).”

Further, I once again bring to your attention (as they may possibly relate to future NCTCOG considerations) the following facts:

The so-called “Alignment 2(b)” would undeniably threaten, irreparably harm and severely damage the Reunion development as well as the potential for new economic activity adjacent to Dallas’ new \$3 billion Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center.

“Alignment 2(b),” would contravene and interfere with the City’s and Hunt’s legal and lawful rights under their Reunion Master Agreement – in place since 1975.

NCTCOG’s continued action involving the so-called “Alignment 2(b)” is in defiance and disregard of the Resolutions passed unanimously by the City Council of the City of Dallas on, respectively, June 12, 2024 and January 21, 2026.

Please professionally confirm your receipt of this letter and compliance with its demands.

Sincerely,

/s/ Eric Gambrell
Eric Gambrell

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
2300 N. Field Street
Suite 1800
Dallas, TX 75201

T +1 214.969.2800
F +1 214.969.4343
akingump.com



ERIC GAMBRELL
214.969.2799/214.969.4343
egambrell@akingump.com

March 16, 2026

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
North Central Texas Council of Governments
616 Six Flags Drive
Arlington, Texas 76011

Re: Billion Dollar Cut in High-Speed Rail Taxpayer Funding Becomes Federal Law

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

As you know, I represent Hunt Realty Investments, Hunt Consolidated, Inc., Ray L. Hunt and certain other affiliated and/or related entities (collectively, "Hunt").

As an update to our previous progress reports on federal legislation relating to high-speed rail, please be advised that H.R. 7148 was passed into law (Public Law 119-175). For your convenience in accessing the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2026, I provide the link to the full text here: <https://www.congress.gov/119/bills/hr7148/BILLS-119hr7148enr.pdf>.

*This Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2026 cut **\$982,000,000.00** in previously appropriated federal funding for high-speed rail in America.*

As a contextual note, you might be interested to learn that the level of support for this law eviscerating high-speed rail public subsidies on the backs of the U.S. taxpayers included 71 affirmative votes in the United States Senate.

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
March 16, 2026
Page 2

NCTCOG has a binary choice regarding alignment “2(b)”:

- (1) NCTCOG can divert and subsequently waste one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) to fund conjectural legal expenses responding to letters discussing the problems with alignment “2(b)”

or
- (2) NCTCOG can make the FTA aware of its own conclusion that alignment “2(b)” is “fatally flawed,” not “possible,” and therefore ineligible for and withdrawn from future consideration as part of any NEPA application process – which action would moot any future letters regarding alignment “2(b).”

Further, I once again bring to your attention (as they may possibly relate to future NCTCOG considerations) the following facts:

The so-called “Alignment 2(b)” would undeniably threaten, irreparably harm and severely damage the Reunion development as well as the potential for new economic activity adjacent to Dallas’ new \$3 billion Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center.

“Alignment 2(b),” would contravene and interfere with the City’s and Hunt’s legal and lawful rights under their Reunion Master Agreement – in place since 1975.

NCTCOG’s continued action involving the so-called “Alignment 2(b)” is in defiance and disregard of the Resolutions passed unanimously by the City Council of the City of Dallas on, respectively, June 12, 2024 and January 21, 2026.

Please professionally confirm your receipt of this letter and compliance with its demands.

Sincerely,

/s/ Eric Gambrell

Eric Gambrell

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
2300 N. Field Street
Suite 1800
Dallas, TX 75201

T +1 214.969.2800
F +1 214.969.4343
akingump.com

Akin

ERIC GAMBRELL
214.969.2799/214.969.4343
egambrell@akingump.com

March 23, 2026

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
North Central Texas Council of Governments
616 Six Flags Drive
Arlington, Texas 76011

Re: Alternative forms of transportation technology in Texas have left federally-rejected high-speed rail behind

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

As you know, I represent Hunt Realty Investments, Hunt Consolidated, Inc., Ray L. Hunt and certain other affiliated and/or related entities (collectively, "Hunt").

Last week, I reported to you that the federal government had stripped nearly a billion dollars of federal taxpayer dollars previously appropriated for high-speed rail. This sweeping evisceration followed a long line of similar rejections of federal subsidies for various high-speed rail projects across the country. Possible future Dallas-to-Houston high-speed rail was not spared from that gutting: as we promptly informed you, the United States Department of Transportation, in pulling federal funds from the Texas project, specifically singled it out as a "waste of taxpayer funds."

The purpose of this correspondence is to courteously apprise you that, following the rejection of Texas high-speed rail, the federal government has announced its support for a different technology for regional transportation between the four major cities of Texas, namely Dallas, Houston, San Antonio and Austin. More specifically, the Secretary of Transportation recently announced its selection of the Texas Department of Transportation ("TxDOT") "to be part of the new Electric Vertical Takeoff and Landing (eVTOL) Integration Pilot Program (eIPP)." <https://www.transportation.gov/briefing-room/future-aviation-here-trumps-transportation-secretary-sean-p-duffy-and-faa-unveil>.

The "goal" of this new Texas project is a "regional network" "of passenger 'air taxi' flights" "connecting Dallas, Austin, San Antonio, and Houston." <https://www.txdot.gov/about/newsroom/stories/txdot-selected-for-futuristic-air-taxi-testing-program.html>. The United States Department of Transportation has hailed this effort as "leveraging next-gen aircraft to radically redefine personal travel, regional transportation, cargo logistics, emergency medicine, and so much more." <https://www.transportation.gov/briefing-room/future-aviation-here-trumps-transportation-secretary-sean-p-duffy-and-faa-unveil>.

Ken Kirkpatrick
 General Counsel
 March 23, 2026
 Page 2

Media reports have unsurprisingly and bluntly characterized this dramatic switch away from (and abandonment of) high-speed rail as the federal government “betting on a different kind of futuristic transportation—one that lifts off vertically instead of running on tracks.”
<https://www.chron.com/news/houston-texas/transportation/article/air-taxis-texas-trump-22063257.php>.

NCTCOG has a binary choice regarding alignment “2(b)”:

- (1) NCTCOG can continue to waste taxpayer monies entrusted to it to fund misdirected expenses relating to the patently impractical alignment “2(b)”

or

- (2) NCTCOG can make the FTA aware of its own conclusion that alignment “2(b)” is “fatally flawed,” not “possible,” and therefore ineligible for and withdrawn from future consideration as part of any NEPA application process which action would moot any future letters regarding alignment “2(b).”

Further, I once again bring to your attention (as they may possibly relate to future NCTCOG considerations) the following facts:

The so-called “Alignment 2(b)” would undeniably threaten, irreparably harm and severely damage the Reunion development as well as the potential for new economic activity adjacent to Dallas’ new \$3 billion Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center.

“Alignment 2(b),” would contravene and interfere with the City’s and Hunt’s legal and lawful rights under their Reunion Master Agreement – in place since 1975.

NCTCOG’s continued action involving the so-called “Alignment 2(b)” is in defiance and disregard of the Resolutions passed unanimously by the City Council of the City of Dallas on, respectively, June 12, 2024 and January 21, 2026.

Please professionally confirm your receipt of this letter and compliance with its demands.

Sincerely,

/s/ Eric Gambrell

Eric Gambrell

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
2300 N. Field Street
Suite 1800
Dallas, TX 75201

T +1 214.969.2800
F +1 214.969.4343
akingump.com



ERIC GAMBRELL
214.969.2799/214.969.4343
egambrell@akingump.com

March 30, 2026

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
North Central Texas Council of Governments
616 Six Flags Drive
Arlington, Texas 76011

Re: The Environmental Impact Statement Technical Memorandum endorsed by Michael Morris finds a two-hour one-way travel time for possible future Dallas-to-Arlington Entertainment District-to-Fort Worth higher-speed rail/the “three seat-ride” to the Arlington Entertainment District

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

As you know, I represent Hunt Realty Investments, Hunt Consolidated, Inc., Ray L. Hunt and certain other affiliated and/or related entities (collectively, “Hunt”).

Michael Morris, in his capacity as Transportation Director of the North Central Texas Council of Governments (the “NCTCOG”), has represented that the one-way travel time on possible future Dallas-to-Arlington Entertainment District-to-Fort Worth higher-speed rail will be 25 minutes. <https://dallascityhall.com/government/citymanager/Documents/Council%20Materials/Transportation%20High%20speed%20rail.pdf>.

To repair that specious record, I have previously apprised you, as the chief lawyer for NCTCOG, that these representations materially omit numerous obvious (and transportation industry-adopted) factors used in determining *actual* travel times that would be experienced by any rider. These universally accepted components in the calculation of overall trip duration include but are certainly not limited to, in NCTCOG’s own words, “travel to and from the [rail station] and prearrival requirements.” See NCTCOG DFW High-Speed Update, 2024 Newsletter, Issue No. 1.

The purpose of this correspondence is to direct your acute attention to certain professional findings contained in the Environmental Impact Statement relating to possible future Dallas-to-Houston high-speed rail, which is oft-touted by Mr. Morris. That document includes a Technical Memorandum regarding Ridership Demand Forecasting Methodology Assessment (the “EIS Technical Memorandum”) relating to possible future Dallas-to-Houston high-speed rail. <https://railroads.dot.gov/elibrary/dallas-houston-hsr-final-eis-appendix-jridership-demand-forecasting-methodology-assessment>.

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
March 30, 2026
Page 2

The EIS Technical Memorandum reports on a comprehensive study of the *actual* amount of time it would take a person from Dallas to get to the location preliminarily designated for the Houston high-speed rail station. This in-depth and detailed analysis incorporates the following four factors in determining total one-way travel time:

- (1) “Intra-city driving” from a person’s home to the location preliminarily designated for the Dallas high-speed rail station;
- (2) “Station access/egress,” which includes finding a place to park and walking into the station;
- (3) “Processing,” which includes going through security, dwell time in the station waiting for the train, and boarding time; and
- (4) “Train” time once the ride starts, until it reaches the location preliminarily designated for the Houston-area high-speed rail station north of downtown Houston.

The EIS Technical Memorandum – applying these factors – concluded that the total travel time for a person in Dallas to reach the station north of Houston would range from 173 to 203 minutes. Of that total time, the “Train” time – the time the train is actually moving – was calculated in the study as between 77 and 83 minutes.

Netting out the “Train” time, the EIS Technical Memorandum determined that the time for a person to leave their Dallas home and get to the moment a train starts moving out of the Dallas station to be between 94 and 120 minutes.

Of course, these exact same four factors to determine total travel time would necessarily be equally applied regarding any possible future Dallas-to-Arlington Entertainment District-to-Fort Worth higher-speed rail ride. The “Intra-city driving,” “Station access/egress,” and “Processing” times would be exactly the same whether a person was going to take a ride from the Dallas station (a) to Houston or (b) to Fort Worth. You would readily agree that the only difference would be the actual time on the moving train.

Applying the 25 minutes Michael Morris has represented would be the actual moving time on a possible future train ride from Dallas to Fort Worth, the resulting overall travel time to the Fort Worth station would be between 119 and 145 minutes. That amounts to – again, according to the data and findings of the EIS Technical Memorandum heralded by Mr. Morris – a two-hour one-way trip to downtown Fort Worth.

Even if the time required for a person to leave their home and get to the Dallas station could be taken out of the equation (obviously it cannot), higher-speed rail to Fort Worth would still be – *according to the data provided by NCTCOG and the EIS Technical Memorandum* – far slower than simply driving in a car. Just the “Station access/egress” and “Processing” time calculated by the EIS Technical Memorandum totals 37 to 45 minutes.

Ken Kirkpatrick
 General Counsel
 March 30, 2026
 Page 3

Adding the 25-minute moving time represented by Mr. Morris, even if an individual lived across the street from the Dallas station, it would take that person between 62 and 70 minutes on a higher-speed rail trip to Fort Worth. Yet, by NCTCOG's own representations, Dallasites could take their cars on the 31-mile stretch of I-30 using TEXPress managed lanes operated by TxDOT and arrive in just 23 to 31 minutes.

Using NCTCOG's own published calculations in combination with the findings in the EIS Technical Memorandum, it is objectively certain that the overall trip duration on possible future Dallas-to-Arlington Entertainment District-to-Fort Worth higher-speed rail is far slower than simply driving.

Of course, the above conclusive showing that driving a car would be far quicker than higher-speed rail does not even include the time it would take a person to disembark the train in Fort Worth and then proceed to find additional/supplemental transportation to reach his or her ultimate destination in the Fort Worth area. You would readily agree that only a tiny percentage of persons traveling from Dallas to Fort Worth have their final destination within a few blocks of the proposed preliminary location for a Fort Worth higher-speed rail station. Assuredly, a person in a car would simply drive directly to their intended location.

Finally, you might use this letter as an opportunity to spur reflection on Mr. Morris' tired and repudiated refrain regarding "one-seat ride." Possible future Dallas-to-Arlington Entertainment District-to-Houston higher-speed rail would require at least a "three-seat ride": (1) a seat in a car, bus, or light rail train to the Dallas station, (2) a second seat on the higher-speed rail train, and (3) a third seat in the car, bus, or light rail train from the Fort Worth station to the ultimate Fort Worth location.

NCTCOG has a binary choice regarding alignment "2(b)":

- (1) NCTCOG can continue to waste taxpayer monies entrusted to it to fund misdirected expenses relating to the patently impractical alignment "2(b)"

or

- (2) NCTCOG can make the FTA aware of its own conclusion that alignment "2(b)" is "fatally flawed," not "possible," and therefore ineligible for and withdrawn from future consideration as part of any NEPA application process – which action would moot any future letters regarding alignment "2(b)."

Ken Kirkpatrick
General Counsel
March 30, 2026
Page 4

Further, I once again bring to your attention (as they may possibly relate to future NCTCOG considerations) the following facts:

The so-called “Alignment 2(b)” would undeniably threaten, irreparably harm and severely damage the Reunion development as well as the potential for new economic activity adjacent to Dallas’ new \$3 billion Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center.

“Alignment 2(b),” would contravene and interfere with the City’s and Hunt’s legal and lawful rights under their Reunion Master Agreement – in place since 1975.

NCTCOG’s continued action involving the so-called “Alignment 2(b)” is in defiance and disregard of the Resolutions passed unanimously by the City Council of the City of Dallas on, respectively, June 12, 2024 and January 21, 2026.

Please professionally confirm your receipt of this letter and compliance with its demands.

Sincerely,

/s/ Eric Gambrell

Eric Gambrell

Traffic

1. FM 407 (Justin Road) – Total: 29,653 vehicles per day;
 - a) Eastbound Direction: 14,863 vehicles per day
 - b) Westbound Direction: 14,790 vehicles per day

2. Simmons Road – Total: 2,937 vehicles per day;
 - a) Northbound Direction: 1,528 vehicles per day
 - b) Southbound Direction: 1,409 vehicles per day

Development Calculated Trip Generation Summary

ITE CODE	LAND USE	UNITS	(WEEKDAY)	AM PEAK HOUR			PM PEAK HOUR		
				TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT
130	Commercial Flex*	42,000 SF	113	9	7	2	10	3	7
822	Strip Retail Plaza (<40k)	31,000 SF	1,688	122	67	55	195	98	97
850	Supermarket	50,000 SF	4,615	148	87	61	440	220	220
911	Walk-in Bank	2,500 SF	—	—	—	—	30	13	17
934	Fast-Food w/ Drive-Thru	6,000 SF	2,689	199	101	98	190	99	91
938	Coffee w/ Drive Thru, No Seating	750 SF	134	30	15	15	11	6	5
944	Gas/Service Station	12 Positions	2,064	136	68	68	171	86	85
Subtotal			11,169	644	345	299	1,047	525	522
Internal Trip Capture			0	84	42	42	144	72	72
Pass-By Trips			3,330*	212	107	105	318	162	156
NET TOTAL			7,839	348	196	152	585	291	294

*Commercial Flex is not a land use provided within the ITE Code. Warehousing (ITE ILC 130) was determined to be the closest use and therefore was utilized for the calculations of this memorandum.

**ITE does not calculate pass-by trips for daily trips. In this study, an average of the AM and PM %'s were applied where applicable. With the circumstances of the locations of the development, it is assumed that traffic traveling Simmons Road will primarily be pass-by traffic.

Roadway Capacity Analysis

As requested by the City, a roadway capacity analysis was performed for each roadway within the scope. The general roadway capacity analysis methodology in this study utilizes The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) methodology which outlines the hourly service volume capacities as shown in the table below.

NCTCOG Roadway Link Hourly Service Volumes By Function

Area Type	Principal Arterial		Minor Arterial		Collector & Local Street	
	Median Divided or One-Way	Undivided, Two-Way	Median Divided or One-Way	Undivided, Two-Way	Median Divided or One-Way	Undivided, Two-Way
CBD	725	650	725	650	475	425
Urban/Commercial	850	775	825	750	525	475
Suburban Residential	925	875	900	825	575	525
Rural	1,025	925	975	875	600	550

Level of Service (LOS) for each roadway link is determined by evaluating the volume:capacity (V/C) ratio and comparing to each Level of Service letter grade as shown in the table below. The V/C for a roadway segment is determined by using the calculated traffic volumes for each analysis scenario and dividing by the theoretical capacity, as shown above. Typically, when LOS exceeds "LOS D" (or 80%), the Approving Agency will require that the roadway be recommended for upgrade. The results of the Roadway Link Analysis are summarized in the table below.

Calculated Impact to Existing Traffic Volumes Summary

(WEEKDAY)	DIRECTION	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUME	DAILY SITE TRAFFIC	% OF SITE TRAFFIC	RESULTING SITE TRAFFIC	SITE/EXISTING (%)
FM 407	EASTBOUND	14,790 vpd	3,920 (7,839/2)	95%	3,724 vpd	25%
	WESTBOUND	14,863 vpd			3,724 vpd	25%
Simmons Road	NORTHBOUND	1,409 vpd		5%	196 vpd	14%
	SOUTHBOUND	1,528 vpd			196 vpd	13%

Volume to Capacity Analysis Results Summary

BACK-SITE TRAFFIC	CAPACITY	V/C	LOS
18,514 vpd	34,000 vpd	0.544	C
18,587 vpd	34,000 vpd	0.547	C
1,605 vpd	10,500 vpd	0.153	A
1,724 vpd	10,500 vpd	0.164	A