



**NEW BRAUNFELS OUTER LOOP TASK FORCE
 TWELFTH MEETING TO FINALIZE RECOMMENDATIONS
 MARCH 6, 2010
 LANDA HAUS IN LANDA PARK
 9:00 A.M. - 4:00 P.M.**

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

<p>ELECTED OFFICIALS: Jay Millikin, Comal County Commissioner</p>	<p>TASK FORCE MEMBERS: Art Brinkkoeter Bennie Bock Brett Reynolds Cheryl Fisher Connie Krause Dean Word Gary Cobb Jim Folbre Jim Reeves Karen Dietz Kevin Lehman Maegan Blaschke Marcie Helmke Marilyn Altwein</p>	<p>CONSULTANTS: Ximenes & Associates, Inc. Linda Ximenes Kennedy Consulting, Inc. Kevin Kennedy, PE Tony Estes RJ RIVERA Associates, Inc. Rudy Rivera, PE Linda Vela Yobana Díaz William Long</p>
---	---	---

The meeting followed the agenda set out. To obtain a copy of the meeting agenda, please visit www.nbolstudy.com and click on the "Public Involvement" page. There you will find the agenda and all handouts that were distributed at this Task Force meeting. The following minutes are meant to document the events of the day. Transcription of public comments are included and made to the extent possible but there is no guarantee of accuracy. These portions of the minutes are indicated and indented.

Agenda Item I - Welcome

Linda Ximenes, the facilitator, convened the twelfth meeting of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force shortly after 9:00 AM. She welcomed those in attendance and thanked them for being there.

Agenda Item II: Introductions

Ms. Ximenes asked the Task Force members in attendance to introduce themselves.

Agenda Item III: Review of the Task Force's Charge and Guidelines

Ms. Ximenes reviewed the charge of the Task Force and the Task Force's Operating Guidelines.

Marilyn Altwein read a statement that she wanted to include in the minutes. She stated that, "When we started I did not know what was expected of me and how to proceed. But thanks to the questions raised and the persistence exhibited to get answers to those questions, it gave me direction and motivation to pursue questions that arose to my mind. For example at our

February meeting Jonathan Bean of TxDOT said that the final study had already been delivered to all of the governing entities. I checked with Guadalupe County and the City of Seguin, neither have received the recent information. Three requests have been made of RJ Rivera for the list of affected land owners. The answer, the same for all three requests was, the study team did not develop a list of property owners directly impacted by the proposed alignment. This information can be obtained by individuals interested in ownership by contacting the County Appraisal District Offices. I went to Guadalupe County Appraisal office. They have absolutely no info on the New Braunfels Outer Loop. As far as press releases to the public, I checked with the newspaper and oh yes, they receive press releases but often they were received too late for publication. I have listened to the audio and read the minutes. In many instances the minutes were not accurate; do not transcribe all vital information. These facts as well as all of the other misinformation, misdirection, omission of facts, misstatements that were discovered and unveiled during these past eleven meetings. I am of the opinion that more of the same exists in this study therefore I can not and will not endorse or support this study by TxDOT and their consultants RJ Rivera and Kennedy Associates. And I charge you Ms. Linda Ximenes, or whoever makes the presentation of the Task Force Recommendations and Addendum to the governing agencies that this statement of mine be included. I am of the opinion that this study should be null and void due to the inaccuracies and inconsistencies. My name is Marilyn Altwein and if this audio does not work again I have a printed copy of this statement that I will be glad to furnish you so that this statement can be included in the recommendations. Also there are 42 members of the Task Force and only 8 are from Guadalupe County. Thank you.”

Ms. Ximenes reviewed the agenda for the meeting with the Task Force. She stated that the notice that went out for the meeting stated the meeting would be held from 9 AM to 6 PM. She made the agenda for the meeting to go till 4 PM and she asked if there were any objections to wrapping the meeting up at 4 PM. She stated she was willing to stay till 6 PM if there was interest in staying later to work on more recommendations. The group agreed to conclude the meeting at 4 PM.

Agenda Item IV: Review the Desired Results of the Meeting

Handout: This information is located at the top of the agenda for this meeting.

- Reach consensus on as many of the Task Force recommendations as possible, beginning with the recommendation ranked “1” and proceeding to as many as possible.
- Outline the process for writing the Task Force report.
- Allow for public comment at the beginning and end of the meeting.

Agenda Item V: Review the Agenda

Handout: This information is located at the bottom half of the agenda for this meeting.

Agenda Item VI: Approval of the Minutes from February 15, 2010

Ms. Ximenes asked for any corrections to the meeting minutes from February 15, 2010.

Connie Krause stated that the minutes from the February meeting named someone with a last name of Maurer as having given a public comment at the end of the meeting and the person’s name was misspelled. She corrected the spelling of the last name to be Maurer. Also, she had mentioned a workshop during the meeting which was actually held from 1 to 5 and not 1 to 7 as the minutes stated.

Karen Dietz stated that she had read a statement at the February meeting that had not been included because of the trouble with the audio recording for the meeting. Ms. Ximenes asked for the written comments which are included here. Correction to 2/15 minutes, page 10

“I Propose that we also include a minority statement for those Task Force members and their alternates (whatever their stand on the loop concept) who continue to have concerns about our ability to meet our charge to ensure technical accuracy, and/or to assure data used to evaluate opinions was sufficient, and/or to ensure screening tools were applied consistently through-out all parts of the study area. This minority statement would provide a vehicle to indicate that there is not full concurrence with the consensus document as designed.”

Sharon Levett stated that at the prior Task Force meeting the issue of a minority statement was left on the table for discussion and she wanted to state again her stance that it would be an important issue to allow one in the addendum. Ms. Ximenes stated that she understood the issue had been settled at the previous meeting. Ms. Levett stated it would be a way for Task Force members who do not support the data in the study as being accurate and used consistently could sign off on the minority statement as a way of saying that so people would not think the whole Task Force was in agreement with the study. Ms. Ximenes responded that she had stated at the previous meeting when the minority report was discussed, and she was saying again, that the addendum would not include a minority report. She said TxDOT had assured her that it would not be a problem to include all of the concerns expressed by the Task Force. She said all of the concerns would be included in the addendum. She stated that she would do an outline of the report and ask for feedback on the outline from the Task Force. From there the draft will be submitted to TxDOT for review and they will make comments. After that the draft would come back to the Task Force for review then back to TxDOT for final review and the Task Force would then receive the final report.

Ms. Levett stated that was not the same as having the minority statement. Ms. Ximenes responded that the addendum would not include a minority report because all of the concerns would be included in the addendum so there was not a need to have a separate minority statement. She said if there was interest among a group of people to have a statement, as citizens, stating their stance on the outer loop study or any topic they were certainly able to do that.

Agenda Item VII: Comments from the Public

Serapio Herrera

[From Serapio Herrera] I hate to say this. I'm not trying to hurt feelings but I have been around here for three years already working with this and it doesn't matter what we do we always have a stop sign. So I got something to say here with all respect. In 2005 the City of New Braunfels approved a loop that was not even a study. It was just a wish loop made by citizens, contactors and developers. And I'm not saying it happened here but it has happened. When a group of people do something like this they do it for their own interests. At that time homes and neighbors were not even an option. When I hear somebody saying, I don't know how to say it but someone almost said lets vote out TxDOT's study and go back to our currently adopted loop. I say shame on him and whoever is behind this. Shame on the people who wanted the loop in 2005, 2006, 2007 and now they don't want the loop. Why, because TxDOT came in here with no interest to nobody. I repeat no interest to nobody. I had a call on March 12, 2008 at 4:07 PM, a twenty minutes conversation on how they wanted to educate the citizens of New Braunfels on how to do things better. I said to myself, New Braunfels has done a great job for over a hundred and fifty years or else ya'll wouldn't be moving in here. And when I asked this individual, "Why didn't you come to the meetings in 2007?" all this individual could come up with was, 'It wasn't going through my land.'" it wasn't going through my land. So I say to Guadalupe County elected officials: "No vote is worth more than the safety and mobility of our future generations." And Comal County, New Braunfels citizens, contractors, developers, county judge, city council and mayor: "You all wanted a loop. TxDOT has one for you now." The preferred loop is a solid study. Since the beginning there have been a lot of stop signs here. City Council, you all wanted a loop, you have one now.

Agenda Item VIII: Review the Process for Reaching Consensus on the Recommendations

Ms. Ximenes stated the group would start with the highest ranked recommendation. She said there were twenty minutes designated for each recommendation and that would get at least fifteen recommendations done. She said Linda Vela would put eighteen minutes on the time countdown which would be shown on the screen so the group could see how much time there was for discussion. The group would have a brief discussion on the recommendation and address any clarification issues that arise. The group would also modify the proposal to address the concerns expressed and work toward reaching consensus with the modifications till everyone in the group can agree with the recommendation.

Agenda Items IX - XV: Seek Consensus on the Ranked Recommendations with Breaks and Lunch

These agenda items have been grouped together and include the Task Force's review and finalization of the recommendations being put forward by the Task Force to any future implementing agency furthering the New Braunfels Outer Loop or any other applicable project. Documentation of the edits and revisions from the original recommendations made to the final recommendations can be tracked on the attached "Recommendations with Track Changes" document. The final recommendations are also attached to these minutes and called "Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Recommendations." Due to the length of the meeting it is unfeasible to provide the level of detail of previous Task Force meeting minutes. Also, the level of detail of the previous meetings' minutes was such that they could be used by the Task Force to get a clear understanding of the proceedings of the meetings they were not able to attend in order to stay informed for future meetings. These minutes do not capture the discussions that took place for each recommendation, but do track the changes as they were made as the meetings proceeded. These changes can be followed on the "Recommendations with Track Changes" document.

The Task Force decided that once the 42nd recommendation was approved by consensus, to remove the rest of the proposed recommendations from the list, but include them in a final list that would be part of the appendices to the Task Force report. Many of the remaining recommendations were considered redundant since they were included in some form in the recommendations that had been approved by the Task Force.

The audio for the meeting will be posted on the website for review.

Agenda Item XVI: Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Ms. Ximenes stated she would send out an outline of the report and submit it to the Task Force for recommendations. She would then write the report and send it initially to TxDOT for their review and then submit to the Task Force for review. It would then go back to TxDOT and they would distribute it. She said she would incorporate feedback from the Task Force one way or another even if she did not include the exact wording it would be reflective of their input.

Agenda Item XVII: Comments from the Public

Martin Levett

[From Martin Levett] I'd like to thank all of the Task Force members for trying to make a difference despite the constraints placed by TxDOT. Two proposals were still on the table at the last meeting, namely a minority statement by Mrs. Dietz and Mr. Bock's regarding the data being accurate and consistently used. And assurances were made by Linda Ximenes to address these proposals at this meeting. TxDOT totally ignoring these proposals is an act of contempt to this Task Force. I have never seen an agency under review that gets to set the agenda and the policy. It speaks volumes about how this is not a process run by you, the members, but really a rubber stamp process. Remember that all of our names are on this request appearing that we agreed that the data is accurate and consistent despite only three Task Force members agreeing with that

statement the first time we voted. So I have here a minority statement. It's Mrs. Dietz's statement that we never got to talk about. It states: 'We the undersigned New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force members or alternates have concerns that the New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force was not able to meet the charges of ensuring technical accuracy and/or ensuring that the screening and evaluation tools were applied consistently throughout all parts of the study area and/or ensuring that the data used was sufficient for the level of planning. The truth always comes out because facts don't lie. History will judge us with 20/20 vision very objectively. Future generations will ask, 'Who were these people and what were they thinking? What did you do when you knew?'

It's never too late to make your opinion heard. I believe we all value our reputation and because I value my reputation I cannot sign off on the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study and will be signing the minority statement. Any of you who wish to sign it can do so outside. I'll have it outside as you leave the meeting. Thank you very much."

Diane Scharnhorst

[From Diane Scharnhorst] One of my main concerns with this is the map data that was used for [Segment B]23 shows Hill Haven as two streets- it's only one. The whole thing was slid over. Rocky Hills was shown in two places on Highway 46- that's not true. I believe that whole section was skewed over which affects the houses counted. One of the concerns listed in this that was eliminated under the concerns was finding Jerome Schumann's property. The address was wrong, that's why you never found it. He gets a bill from NBU. He pays for his electric. A school bus picks his child up; she's ten years old and attends Lamar Elementary. This is a house right in the pathway. It was never counted. We've been told over and over again every house is going to be counted and they weren't. If you have a map that's wrong, it's wrong folks. You spend all this money. I expect the maps to be accurate showing existing streets. These are streets that have been there forever. Now if that is wrong, and I happen to know it, what else was wrong? Also on here [recommendation #] 57 that you just eliminated asked specifically who asked for this. I know the County Commissioners did not vote on this. City Council did not vote on this and the City Attorney has already said we didn't ask for this. The City Council's approved route is a 220-foot loop only. Not 400; not 800. They already spent a lot of time and money identifying 60-foot collectors, 90-foot arterials and the 120s. They are not going to go back and say, "Thank you very much for this new study." How do we go back and explain to all the people who were on the loop before and made plans for being on the loop and those who were not on the loop? One of the things that was not recorded because they didn't record my statement last time was the people on River Road just discovered this. Those people haven't moved. They weren't notified. How are you going to get them on the Loop from River Road. You can't just magically elevate up; there's intersections. The exchange on 2722 will take out more houses. It will be a diamond which will take out houses on all four corners. Those weren't counted either. That's just one example of houses that won't be included. Thank you."

Roy Linnartz proposed that Ms. Ximenes write an executive summary with bullet points of the recommendations that would be at the most two pages in length to give an overview of the recommendations. Rod Smith stated that it would be helpful to have the summary to give an overview of the topic and would be a good overview and introduction to the whole of the recommendations and could also be distributed to the media for their information. Dean Word suggested using the numbered recommendations and not including the lettered items underneath and refer to the full recommendation in the summary somewhere if there is interest in seeing all of the sub pieces to each recommendation. Ms. Ximenes took a temperature. The proposal passed.

Ms. Karen Dietz stated that there was a comment made regarding the proposal she had for a minority statement. She said although the Task Force has agreed to use the consensus format it made it difficult to show where there is disagreement amongst the Task Force members. Ms. Ximenes stated that she intended to include all of the concerns expressed by the Task Force not just the places where there was agreement.

Agenda Item XVIII: Adjourn

Ms. Ximenes thanked all of those in attendance for participation and for working toward consensus. She stated that she appreciated the work and meticulous care that was put into the recommendations and the work leading up to them. The meeting was then adjourned.



NEW BRAUNFELS OUTER LOOP TASK FORCE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT		
RANK	RECOMMENDATION	CONSENSUS REACHED
2	<p>Provide sufficient notification of the public meetings to the public and affected stakeholders using a variety of communication methods. Notification should include information about the kind of input being sought from the public.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continue to use multiple media outlets to get information out about the public meetings.¹ b. Advertise in the paper and radio the purpose for the community input when announcing public meetings. Notices should be sent out in a timely manner and more than once. c. Provide more official-looking notices of public meetings. Use a letter instead of a postcard. d. Be sure to have a good way to communicate with affected landowners. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Notification of affected property owners needs to be improved. ii. That each owner of properties in agricultural use affected by this loop have a reasonable opportunity to provide input with senior-level study consultants (future) iii. Work with appraisal district to contact iv. The definition of affected should include adjacent property owners 	Yes
10	<p>Contact all stakeholders in the universe of options early on, grouping persons by smaller study sections/area and host the meetings in those smaller study areas (divide the loop in 6 parts). This should be done early and provide information for ways they can be helpful in the study. Listen to their concerns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Have a better dialogue, not lectures. b. Provide multiple maps at public meetings. 	Yes
12	<p>Develop a mechanism that reflects how public input is being used in the study.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Accept opinions and information of the public as part of the public input process. b. Show the changes based on community input [on the maps] and provide the maps to the public at least two weeks prior to subsequent meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly publicize where hard copies of the maps will be located for review (libraries, area offices, court house, etc.). 	Yes
15	<p>Provide user-friendly information (like one from TxDOT's Right-of-way division) detailing NEPA items that the public should be aware of including but not limited to the Consulting Party status, Farmland Protection Policy Act, Antiquities Act (Sec. 106, 4F, pertaining State Laws, etc.), Endangered Species Act and any other Acts cover by NEPA. The Acts do not have to be listed in totality but a reference on the Internet or area library could be given as well as the contact information for the state or area office that could provide further information to the public.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide a diagram illustrating a Project Development Process in a flow chart format (a cross between the one given out on June 15, 2009 and the one on page 129 of the Final Report). b. Have this information available at the public meetings and the website. 	Yes
20	<p>The study team and governing entities further developing the corridor should acknowledge correspondence <u>from</u> stakeholders throughout the process.</p>	Yes
21	<p>Improve the operations of the Technical Work Group and the Community Work Group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The sheet like the Screening Process and Sequence of Events one handed out on Feb. 15, 2010, should have been given out and gone over at the first few Technical and Community 	Yes

¹ Information listed below the numbered item reflects the more precise wording of the recommendations as made by the Task Force members in their working groups.

	<p>Workgroup meetings with specific emphasis given to what exactly would happen at each of the Technical/Community Workgroup meetings.</p> <p>b. Someone from the TxDOT's Environmental Affairs Division should attend each of the Technical and Community Work Group meetings and do an overview of what NEPA entails for those in the public that are on these work groups.</p> <p>c. All Technical/ Community Workgroup Members should be receiving their materials in advance via e-mail or mail just like the Task Force has. Their materials should include an "Index of Materials" as well copies of the maps that would be presented at the next Public Meeting/ Open House. Members should also be able to see the responses received via Comment Cards, transcripts from the Court Reporter, e-mails or calls to the hotline as well as any minutes from the MAPO meetings and not just be given the data in numbers, percentages, etc.</p> <p>d. All Technical/ Community Work Group meetings should also be advertised for the public to attend, stating that no public comments will be taken but that their comments would be welcomed via e-mail or by phone to the hotline.</p>	
23	Have data and maps dated and posted in public places for viewing two weeks prior to each meeting (like Technical, Community, Open Houses, etc).	Yes
27	<p>Projected timelines for scheduled meetings/ open houses should be given at the first few rounds of meetings on a sheet like the Screening Process and Sequence of Events one handed out on Feb. 15, 2010.</p> <p>a. This would give the public an idea of when these events would occur and their sequence and not be as vague as the pyramid (referred to as the Phase one Study Approach – Fig. 3 on page 11 of the Final Report) one that was presented at the meetings/ open houses and printed on the mail outs.</p> <p>b. On the back of that sheet there could be explanation/definitions for items like "Universe of Options" and Viable Options as well as a listing of the Screening Criteria that will be used.</p> <p>c. Strive to avoid community wide events when scheduling public or committee meetings.</p>	Yes
31	<p>Decision makers (elected officials, platting authorities, City & County staff, etc.) need to provide ample opportunity for community involvement concurrently with any additional changes for the Outer Loop.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>¹Consensus with Stand Aside: Three Task Force members stood aside and were willing to let the recommendation move forward but were concerned that this recommendation was redundant and not enforceable.</p>	Yes ¹
36	When a stakeholder individual, family, HOA, etc. is visited by TXDOT engineer reps. and given opportunities to voice concerns or to work out possible alternatives to be considered, a follow-up communication to the stakeholder/s should be made if none or few of their concerns are met before these persons are confronted by the changes at a public MAPO meeting.	Yes
NEED AND PURPOSE		
RANK	RECOMMENDATION	CONSENSUS REACHED
1	<p>Clearly define the need and purpose of the roadway through a community-wide discussion.</p> <p>a. Clearly define the purpose of the roadway for urban development or thru travel.</p> <p>b. Create limited access/driveways to control development in certain areas with due regard for the right of access of property owners.</p> <p>c. Have ample ingress/egress on main intersections.</p> <p>d. Define the actual need.</p> <p>e. Determine whether it is a need or a want.</p> <p>f. Have better traffic studies and forecasts, long term (50-100 years).</p> <p>g. The need and purpose should more accurately describe land use patterns.</p> <p>h. The loop should be a tool for management and direction of growth.</p> <p>i. Options to a loop should be considered up front. Provide evidence/information to support the assertion that building a loop will decrease traffic accidents.</p>	Yes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> j. Provide evidence/information to support the assertion that emergency service provider travel will be enhanced. Example: Seek input from local emergency service provider as how their response time will be effected. k. Clearly define the purpose of the roadway for urban development, industrial development and commercial or retail development planning or to allow for the continuation of agriculture and preservation of open/green space for all counties involved and how the loop could improve safety and mobility. 	
9	Thoroughly review existing roadways and use of them to meet transportation needs.	Yes
17	<p>Provide more information to the public on the consequences of building the loop—tax issues, property valuations, environmental impacts, impacts to downtown, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify the economic impact to downtown New Braunfels, Seguin, and surrounding areas in a more specific needs and purpose statement that the city and county need to address. b. Review impacts to water supply and contamination. 	Yes
CONSTRAINTS		
RANK	RECOMMENDATION	CONSENSUS REACHED
3	<p>Be clear and consistent when defining, naming and identifying constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Constraints should be measurable and not so subjective. b. Show all constraints on the maps using specific markers for each one. c. Use a consistent number of criteria for the matrix. We understand decisions have been made using up to 31 different criteria but see only 17 constraints used on the matrix for each section. 	Yes
7	<p>Identify constraints that are regulated by law, such as environmental, wetlands, species, historic elements, cemeteries, parks, and schools with special protection; there are elements that can be mitigated with varying degrees of difficulty (MINIMIZE/MITIGATE/OR AVOID)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify which constraints are covered by statutes, regulations, or law and identify those regulations 	Yes
11	<p>Be sure the details are correct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Be sure all maps are as accurate as possible showing Federally Required Constraints, cemeteries, property lines, the aquifer and contributing zones, power lines, homes known, platted properties, etc. All this should be accessible knowledge if given priority as part of the study early in the process. b. This may mean "feet on the ground" and time but would eliminate much frustration generated when put off until the end of a study...in fact even after the study has been submitted to platting authorities. 	Yes
13	<p>Give additional consideration to historical farms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Texas Dept. of Agriculture Family Land Heritage program should be used as a criterion, in order to protect historic farms. b. Use criteria established in Farmland Protection Policy Act to evaluate impact to farmlands (Farmland Conversion Impact Rating). Use FPPA criteria to reduce impacts to important farmlands before route is chosen. c. Historical land should have the same exempt status as 50 year or older homes 	Yes
16	<p>Be sure all data for maps and reports uses the most up to date source, such as GIS with overlays from that source: property lines, streams, aquifer recharge and contributing zones, houses, etc so information is up to date and from a consistent resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify the sources for data used. Public as well as engineers and others can then reference updates as needed or added by the system. 	Yes
18	Minimize impact on agricultural properties; an effort should be made to follow property lines.	Yes
19	Identify all residential structures that would be affected.	Yes

24	<p>Constraints should be tailored to community issues and not just come from a generic list from TxDOT.</p> <p>a. For example, list the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone as a separate constraint.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>²Consensus with Stand Aside: The recommendation reached consensus with a stand aside by Task Force members who felt listing the Edwards Aquifer as a separate constraint was redundant.</p>	Yes ²
34	Using appraisal district data quantify total agriculturally exempt acreage being affected as well as the parcels that are being divided.	Yes
41	<p>Constraints that should be evaluated beyond what the study considered.</p> <p>a. Disclose loss of acreage and buildings at proposed intersections.</p> <p>b. Identify the boundary lines of properties affected by the Outer Loop that contain an unaffected building that is currently on the national register.</p>	Yes

FACILITY TYPE

RANK	RECOMMENDATION	CONSENSUS REACHED
14	<p>Clearly explain the different facility types and the impacts each would have on different aspects of community needs and affected property owners.</p> <p>a. Give a better presentation on the facility types to the public. People need to be aware of the various facilities and how each one will affect their property and lives.</p> <p>b. Show how the facility type/size impact other community needs.</p> <p>c. Provide examples of how small you can make the right of way and still accommodate transportation needs and avoid the constraints.</p> <p>d. Create overlays to show varieties of traffic exchanges at major roads on the maps, to scale so property owners and neighboring entities can accurately understand the potential impact.</p>	Yes
28	Reassess facility size to align with need and purpose. Be aware that reducing the size will reduce the impacts to all constraint categories. Wherever appropriate, look for opportunities to minimize/decrease the width by customizing the facility type to distinct areas.	Yes

SCREENING PROCESS

RANK	RECOMMENDATION	CONSENSUS REACHED
6	<p>Re-evaluate the screening data. [Refer to recommendation #4 under Miscellaneous for a list of examples.]</p> <p>-----</p> <p>³Concern: There was one Task Force member not willing to let the recommendation move forward and their concern with item o was that environmental work should be done at the level appropriate for this level of study.</p>	No ³ ; 1 Down (See Concerns)

MISCELLANEOUS

RANK	RECOMMENDATION	CONSENSUS REACHED
4	<p>Inform each authority that there are concerns regarding potential inconsistencies and inaccurate information in the report.</p> <p>a. After the past 11 months, everything that has been discussed, argued, and identified as an inaccuracy or inconsistency (in anyone's opinion) must be noted in detail and provided in clear language to anyone wanting a copy of our work.</p> <p>b. There will be a list of these included in the report along with the responses.</p> <p>c. For example:</p> <p>a. Each entity (authority) [should] choose to look hard at inconsistencies found in the data (Sec B, C, E, D)</p> <p>b. Please re-evaluate route 7, section C to see if it is possible to reduce the encroachment on the Pantermuehl Ranch.</p> <p>c. In section B at FM 2722 consideration should be taken where the new intersection would be has a blind spot area if the interchange is street level.</p>	Yes ³

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. They should rethink the crossing over the upper Guadalupe and maybe not allow access to the river. e. In <u>section C</u> they should relook where it crosses 306 going into section B to see if they can find another area to cross. f. In <u>section D</u>, look for an area that does not flood as badly as the area chosen, realizing that all of that general area has some flooding and consider how the properties are crossed as to leave as little impact as possible. g. Have a truly independent and objective group of city planners, transportation experts and road builders evaluate and verify the data and consistency of the use of the data and make recommendations regarding the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study (i.e.: Texas Transportation Institute at Texas A& University). h. Reevaluate all Short list options matrices for accuracy and consistency. i. In Section A, evaluate and verify why route options that were eliminated due to residential impacts, etc. were brought back later and in some cases used for the final recommended route. j. In Section B, validate the existence and location of Jerome Schumann's residence at 530 Elm Creek Road located directly in the path of option B-23 and not included in the B section matrix. k. In Section B, evaluate why and how 3 houses disappeared off of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Recommended Corridor (West of IH 35) map displayed online after the January 31, 2008 Open House meeting. l. In Section B, evaluate why the Viable Options list in the B section with a total of 22 route options was allowed to expand to a total of 27 route options on the Short Options list despite assurances on the New Braunfels Outer Loop web site and verbally by the consultants that the routes would be "refined, narrowed down, eliminated, etc". m. Reexamine and verify the conclusion of the recommended route in regards to the West Side Modification matrix, now that an error in the data regarding a Residence/Sensitive Noise Receiver has been discovered which changes the matrix. n. Evaluate why and how the home at 3696 FM 306 was incorrectly placed in the C section map, despite two senior professional engineers obtaining GPS data to locate the home. o. Use an independent environmental consultant to verify the accuracy of the environmental data collected by TCB/SWCA for the New Braunfels Outer Loop study. p. That the cemetery questioned by Mr. Schulze be located, verified and correctly placed on the map. q. Ensure that drainage easements are purchased and maintained as part of the loop construction. r. Ensure that all MAPO meetings open to the public meet the requirements of the Texas Open Meetings Act. <p>-----</p> <p><i>For the list of concerns identified by the Task Force and responses from the study team please refer to the section on Task Force Findings and Recommendations in this Addendum.</i></p>	
22	<p>The Task Force members should be given an opportunity to see and sign off on the final report and presentation materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. TxDOT will offer to make a presentation to each decision making body reviewing the Final Task Force Report.² b. Advance notification should be given to the Task Force members of any presentations made to governing boards. 	Yes
29	<p>Incorporate an increased level of environmental information into the early design of alternatives to do a better job of identifying sensitive environmental features unique to the local community and understanding potential impacts to them, for example, Hill Country, Guadalupe River crossings, Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, Prime and Unique Farmland.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>⁴ <i>Concern: There were four Task Force members not willing to let the recommendation move forward and their concern was that if you can't afford to spend the money to do more, you don't do more and you get into a vicious cycle where nothing is done. There is plenty of reason to be concerned about environmental</i></p>	No ⁴ ; 4 Down (See Concerns)

² Please note that Task Force members will have an opportunity to see and give feedback on the report of the Task Force activities, recommendations and findings before it is finalized.

	<i>impacts but it does not make sense economically to delve deeper into that at this level of study.</i>	
38	<p>Decision-making bodies should obtain information or hold workshops for staff regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. NEPA and Section 106 synopsis b. 1906 antiquities law and Texas antiquities laws to date c. Noise abatement d. Biological studies e. Hydrology studies <p>-----</p> <p>⁵<i>Concern: There were ten Task Force member not willing to let the recommendation move forward and 2 who did not agree with the recommendation in its current state.. The concerns included a sentiment that the Task Force was going beyond its Charge and that the recommendation was not necessary. They did not agree with the recommendation because they felt it was not related to the loop project.</i></p>	<p>No⁵; 10 Down 2 Sideways (See Concerns)</p>

Draft



**NEW BRAUNFELS OUTER LOOP TASK FORCE
RECOMMENDATIONS IN RANKED ORDER**

RANKED RECOMMENDATIONS	
Rank	Recommendation
1	<p><i>Need and Purpose – <u>DECISION REACHED ON THIS ONE</u></i></p> <p>3. Clearly define the need and purpose of the roadway <u>through a community-wide discussion. <u>DECISION MADE ON THIS CHANGE</u></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clearly define the purpose of the roadway for urban development or thru travel. b. Create limited access/driveways to control development in certain areas <u>with due regard for the right of access of property owners.</u> c. Have ample ingress/egress on main intersections. d. Define the actual need. e. Determine whether it is a need or a want. f. Have better traffic studies and forecasts, long term (50-100 years). g. The need and purpose should more accurately describe land use patterns. h. The loop should be a tool for management and direction of growth. i. Options to a loop should be considered up front. Provide evidence/information to support the assertion that building a loop will decrease traffic accidents. j. Provide evidence/information to support the assertion that emergency service provider travel will be enhanced. Example: Seek input from local emergency service provider as how their response time will be effected. k. Clearly define the purpose of the roadway for urban development, industrial development and commercial or retail development planning <u>or to allow for the continuation of agriculture and preservation of open/green space</u> for all counties involved and how the loop could improve safety and mobility.

2	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> <u>DECISION REACHED ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>1. Provide sufficient notification of the public meetings to the public and affected stakeholders using a variety of communication methods. Notification should include information about the kind of input being sought from the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continue to use multiple media outlets to get information out about the public meetings.¹ b. Advertise in the paper and radio the purpose for the community input when announcing public meetings. <u>Notices should be sent out in a timely manner and more than once.</u> c. Provide more official-looking notices of public meetings. Use a letter instead of a postcard. d. <u>Be sure to have a good way to communicate with affected landowners.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>Notification of affected property owners needs to be improved.</u> ii. <u>That each owner of properties in agricultural use affected by this loop have a reasonable opportunity to provide input with senior-level study consultants (future)</u> iii. <u>Work with appraisal district to contact</u> iv. <u>The definition of affected should include adjacent property owners</u>
3	<p><i>Constraints</i> <u>DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>1. Be clear and consistent when defining, naming and identifying constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Constraints should be measurable and not so subjective.</u> b. <u>Show all constraints on the maps using specific markers for each one.</u> c. <u>Use a consistent number of criteria for the matrix. We understand decisions have been made using up to 31 different criteria but see only 17 constraints used on the matrix for each section.</u>

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 0" + Indent

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 1.13" + Tab after: 0" +

Comment [Y.D.1]: This was originally Public Involvement Recommendation #2 which was added to this Recommendation.

Deleted: <#>Be consistent in naming the constraints categories.¶ <#>Clearly define the constraints before asking the public to rank them. Clarify definitions so that everyone understands them. ¶

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

¹ Information listed below the numbered item reflects the more precise wording of the recommendations as made by the Task Force members in their working groups.

4	<p><i>Miscellaneous <u>DECISION MADE ON THIS RECOMMENDATION</u></i></p> <p>10. Inform each authority that there <u>are concerns regarding potential</u> inconsistencies and inaccurate information in the report.</p> <p>a. After the past 11 months, everything that has been discussed, argued, and identified as an inaccuracy or inconsistency (in anyone’s opinion) must be noted in detail and provided in clear language to anyone wanting a copy of our work.</p> <p><u>b. There will be a list of these included in the report along with the responses.</u></p>	<p>Deleted: may be some</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p>
5	<p><i>Public Involvement</i></p> <p>e. <u>This was combined with 2.</u></p>	<p>Comment [Y.D.2]: This Recommendation was combined with Public Involvement Recommendation #1.</p> <p>Deleted: Be sure to have a good way to communicate with affected landowners.¶</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> <p>Deleted: <#>Notification of affected property owners needs to be improved.¶ That each owner of farmland that is affected by this loop receive a personal visit from Mr. Rivera or Mr. Kennedy</p>

Screening Process

NO CONSENSUS, ONE DOWN

CONCERN: THE ENVIRONMENTAL WORK WAS DONE AT THE LEVEL THAT WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THIS LEVEL OF STUDY. (REGARDING LETTER O)

1. Re-evaluate the screening data **for example:**

- a. Each entity (authority) [should] choose to look hard at inconsistencies found in the data (Sec B, C, E, D)
- b. Please re-evaluate route 7, section C to see if it is possible to reduce the encroachment on the Pantermuehl Ranch
- c. In section B at FM 2722 consideration should be taken where the new intersection would be has a blind spot area if the interchange is street level.
- d. They should rethink the crossing over the upper Guadalupe and maybe not allow access to the river.
- e. In section C they should relook where it crosses 306 going into section B to see if they can find another area to cross.
- f. In section D, look for an area that does not flood as badly as the area chosen, realizing that all of that general area has some flooding and consider how the properties are crossed as to leave as little impact as possible.
- g. Have a truly independent and objective group of city planners, transportation experts and road builders evaluate and verify the data and consistency of the use of the data and make recommendations regarding the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study (i.e.: Texas Transportation Institute at Texas A& University).
- h. Reevaluate all Short list options matrices for accuracy and consistency.
- i. In Section A, evaluate and verify why route options that were eliminated due to residential impacts, etc. were brought back later and in some cases used for the final recommended route.
- j. In Section B, validate the existence and location of Jerome Schumann's residence at 530 Elm Creek Road located directly in the path of option B-23 and not included in the B section matrix.
- k. In Section B, evaluate why and how 3 houses disappeared off of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Recommended Corridor (West of IH 35) map displayed online after the January 31, 2008 Open House meeting.
- l. In Section B, evaluate why the Viable Options list in the B section with a total of 22 route options was allowed to expand to a total of 27 route options on the Short Options list despite assurances on the New Braunfels Outer Loop web site and verbally by the consultants that the routes would be "refined, narrowed down, eliminated, etc."
- m. Reexamine and verify the conclusion of the recommended route in regards to the West Side Modification matrix, now that an error in the data regarding a Residence/Sensitive Noise Receiver has been discovered which changes the matrix.
- n. Evaluate why and how the home at 3696 FM 306 was incorrectly placed in the C section map, despite two senior professional engineers obtaining GPS data to locate the home.
- o. Use an independent environmental consultant to verify the accuracy of the environmental data collected by TCB/SWCA for the New Braunfels Outer Loop study.

Deleted: .

Comment [Y.D.3]: This should be the list of concerns that should go under number 4.

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: Dietz

Deleted: farm

Formatted: Not Strikethrough, Highlight

Deleted: they might want to rethink the change to B23, the power lines are the flattest area to run the road, as well as take into consideration

Formatted: Highlight

6

Deleted: investigate

Deleted: investigate

Deleted: investigate

Deleted: Investigate

Formatted: Highlight

7	<p><i>Constraints</i> <u>DECISION ON THIS RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>3. Identify <u>constraints</u> that are regulated by law, such as environmental, wetlands, species, historic elements, cemeteries, parks, and schools with special protection; <u>there are elements that can be mitigated with varying degrees of difficulty (MINIMIZE/MITIGATE/OR AVOID)</u>.</p> <p>a. Identify which constraints are covered by statutes, regulations, or law and identify those regulations</p> <p>b. Identify things that are regulated by law, such as environmental, wetlands, species, historic, cemeteries, schools, as non-negotiables with special protection.</p>	<p>Deleted: things</p> <p>Deleted: as non-negotiable</p> <p>Deleted: .</p> <p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p>
8	<p><i>Need and Purpose</i></p> <p>1. <u>moved to Recommendation 1</u>,</p>	<p>Deleted: Have a community-wide discussion on detailed needs to be addressed and to supplement general needs previously identified.</p>
9	<p><i>Need and Purpose – DECISION ON RECOMMENDATION</i></p> <p>1. Thoroughly review existing roadways and use of them <u>to meet transportation needs</u>.</p>	<p>Deleted: Miscellaneous</p>
10	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> <u>DECISION ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>10. Contact all stakeholders in the universe of options early on, grouping persons by <u>smaller study sections/area and host the meetings in those smaller study areas (divide the loop in 6 parts)</u>. This should be done early and provide information for ways they can be helpful in the study. Listen to their concerns.</p> <p><u>a. Have a better dialogue, not lectures.</u></p> <p><u>b. Provide multiple maps at public meetings.</u></p>	<p>Deleted: in person</p> <p>Deleted: even if it involves</p> <p>Deleted: area</p> <p>Deleted: and involves many meetings</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> <p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt</p>

11	<p><u>Constraints – DECISION REACHED ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>9. Be sure the details are correct.</p> <p>a. Be sure all maps are as accurate as possible showing Federally Required Constraints, cemeteries, property lines, the aquifer and contributing zones, power lines, homes known, platted properties, etc. All this should be accessible knowledge if given priority as part of the study early in the process.</p> <p>b. This may mean "feet on the ground" and time but would eliminate much frustration generated when put off until the end of a study...in fact even after the study has been submitted to platting authorities.</p> <p>c. That the cemetery questioned by Mr. Schulze be located, verified and correctly placed on the map</p>	<p>Deleted: Miscellaneous</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> <p>Comment [Y.D.4]: Move this to list of concerns in Recommendation ranked #6.</p>
12	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> <u>DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>7. Develop a mechanism that reflects how public input is being used in the study.</p> <p>a. Accept opinions and information of the public as part of the public input process.</p> <p>b. Show the changes based on community input [on the maps] <u>and provide the maps to the public at least two weeks prior to subsequent meetings.</u></p> <p>- <u>Clearly publicize where hard copies of the maps will be located for review (libraries, area offices, court house, etc.).</u></p>	<p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> <p>Deleted: .</p>

13	<p><i>Constraints</i> <u>DECISION REACHED ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>11. Give <u>additional</u> consideration to historical farms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Texas Dept. of Agriculture Family Land Heritage program should be used as <u>a criterion</u>, in order to protect historic farms. b. Use criteria established in Farmland Protection Policy Act to evaluate impact to farmlands (Farmland Conversion Impact Rating). Use FPPA criteria to <u>reduce impacts to</u> important farmlands before route is chosen. c. Historical land should have the same exempt status as 50 year or older homes
14	<p><i>Facility Type</i> <u>DECISION REACHED ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>3. Clearly explain the different facility types and the impacts each would have on different aspects of community needs and affected property owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Give a better presentation on the facility types to the public. People need to be aware of the various facilities and how each one will affect their property and lives. b. Show how the facility type/size impact other community needs. c. Provide examples of how small you can make the right of way and still accommodate transportation needs and avoid the constraints. d. Hike and bike should be a separate facility, not a paved symbol on asphalt. e. Create overlays to show varieties of traffic exchanges at major roads on the maps, to scale so property owners and neighboring entities can accurately understand the <u>potential</u> impact.

Deleted: special c

Deleted: a for avoidance

Deleted: avoid

15	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> <u>DECISION REACHED ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>13. <u>Provide user-friendly information</u> (like one from Tx DOT's Right-of-way division) detailing NEPA items that the public should be aware of including but not limited to the Consulting Party status, Farmland Protection Policy Act, Antiquities Act (Sec. 106, 4F, pertaining State Laws, etc.), Endangered Species Act and any other Acts cover by NEPA. The Acts do not have to be listed in totality but a reference on the Internet or area library could be given as well as the contact information for the state or area office that could provide further information to the public.</p> <p>a. <u>Provide</u> a diagram illustrating a Project Development Process <u>in a flow chart format</u> (a cross between the one given out on June 15, 2009 and the one on page 129 of the Final Report).</p> <p>b. <u>Have this information available at the public meetings and the website.</u></p>	<p>Deleted: A booklet</p> <p>Deleted: that is put together by the Environmental Affairs Division</p> <p>Deleted: The booklet could also include</p> <p>Deleted: that is</p> <p>Deleted:</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p>
16	<p><u>Constraints - DECISION ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>16. Be sure all data for maps and reports uses the <u>most up to date</u> source, such as GIS with overlays from that source: property lines, streams, aquifer recharge and contributing zones, houses, etc so <u>information</u> is up to date and from a consistent resource.</p> <p>a. <u>Identify the sources</u> for data <u>used. Public as well as engineers and others can then reference updates as needed or added by the system.</u></p>	<p>Deleted: <i>Public</i></p> <p>Deleted: <i>Involvement</i></p> <p>Deleted: Task Force members as well as engineers and others can then reference updates as needed or added by the system.</p> <p>Deleted: If a different</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> <p>Deleted: is used in addition, that should be noted.</p>

17	<p><i>Need and Purpose</i> <u>DECISION ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>2. Provide more information to the public on the consequences of building the loop—tax issues, property valuations, environmental impacts, impacts to downtown, etc.</p> <p>a. Identify the economic impact to downtown New Braunfels, Seguin, and surrounding areas in a more specific needs and purpose statement that the city and county need to address.</p> <p>b. Review <u>impacts to</u> water supply and contamination.</p>	<p>Deleted: e</p> <p>Deleted: <#>Provide more information to the public on the consequences of building the loop—tax issues, property evaluations, environmental impacts, etc.¶</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p>
18	<p><i>Constraints</i> <u>DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>12. Minimize impact on <u>agricultural properties; an effort should be made to follow</u> property lines.</p>	<p>Deleted:</p> <p>Deleted: needs/</p> <p>Deleted: small farm</p> <p>Deleted: properties,</p> <p>Deleted: by using</p>
19	<p><i>Constraints</i> <u>DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>10. Identify all <u>residential structures</u> that would be affected.</p>	<p>Deleted: existing</p> <p>Deleted: homes</p>
20	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> <u>DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>11. <u>The study team and governing entities further developing the corridor should</u> acknowledge correspondence <u>from</u> stakeholders throughout the process.</p>	<p>Deleted: Find ways to</p>

21	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> <u>DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>15. Improve the operations of the Technical Work Group and the Community Work Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The sheet like the Screening Process and Sequence of Events one handed out on Feb. 15, 2010, should have been given out and gone over at the first few Technical and Community Workgroup meetings with specific emphasis given to what exactly would happen at each of the Technical/Community Workgroup meetings. b. Someone from the TxDOT's Environmental Affairs Division should attend each of the Technical and Community Work Group meetings and do an overview of what NEPA entails for those in the public that are on these work groups. c. All Technical/ Community Workgroup Members should be receiving their materials in advance via e-mail or mail just like the Task Force has. Their materials should include an "Index of Materials" as well copies of the maps that would be presented at the next Public Meeting/ Open House. Members should also be able to see the responses received via Comment Cards, transcripts from the Court Reporter, e-mails or calls to the hotline as well as any minutes from the MAPO meetings and not just be given the data in numbers, percentages, etc. d. All Technical/ Community Work Group meetings should also be advertised for the public to attend, stating that no public comments will be taken but that their comments would be welcomed via e-mail or by phone to the hotline.
22	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i> <u>DECISION ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>16. The Task Force members should be given an opportunity to see and sign off on the final report <u>and presentation materials.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>TxDOT will offer to make a presentation to each decision making body reviewing the Final Task Force Report.²</u> b. <u>Advance notification should be given to the Task Force members of any presentations made to governing boards.</u>
23	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> <u>DECISION ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>6. Have data and maps <u>dated and</u> posted in public places for viewing <u>two weeks prior to each meeting (like Technical, Community, Open Houses, etc.).</u></p>

Deleted: .

Deleted: to be made to

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: and the

Deleted: Loop Study

² Please note that Task Force members will have an opportunity to see and give feedback on the report of the Task Force activities, recommendations and findings before it is finalized.

24	<p>Constraints <u>DECISION ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p><u>CONCERN: Listing Edwards Aquifer is redundant.</u></p> <p>2. Constraints should be tailored to community issues and not <u>just</u> come from a generic list from TxDOT.</p> <p>a. <u>For example, list the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone as a separate constraint.</u></p>	Deleted: L
25	<p>Constraints <u>DECISION MADE TO REMOVE</u></p> <p>6. Develop the study in a way that identifies an area where there are no subdivisions so that a roadway can be built.</p>	<p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Strikethrough</p> <p>Formatted: Not Strikethrough</p> <p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Strikethrough</p>
26	<p>Facility Type <u>DECISION MADE TO REMOVE</u></p> <p>1. The local community should control the facility type.</p>	<p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Not Italic, Strikethrough</p> <p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Not Italic, Strikethrough</p> <p>Formatted: Highlight</p>
27	<p>Public Involvement <u>DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>14. <u>Projected</u> timelines for <u>scheduled</u> meetings/ open houses should be given at the first few rounds of meetings on a sheet like the Screening Process and Sequence of Events one handed out on Feb. 15, 2010.</p> <p>a. This would give the public an idea of when these events would occur and their sequence and not be as vague as the pyramid (referred to as the Phase one Study Approach – Fig. 3 on page 11 of the Final Report) one that was presented at the meetings/ open houses and printed on the mail outs.</p> <p>b. On the back of that sheet there could be explanation/definitions for items like “Universe of Options” and Viable Options as well as a listing of the Screening Criteria that will be used.</p> <p>c. <u>Strive to avoid community-wide events when scheduling public or committee meetings.</u></p>	<p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Strikethrough</p> <p>Formatted: Highlight</p> <p>Deleted: T</p> <p>Deleted: all</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p>

Facility Type DECISION ON THIS RECOMMENDATION

28 5. Reassess facility size to align with need and purpose. Be aware that reducing the size will reduce the impacts to all constraint categories. Wherever appropriate, look for opportunities to minimize/decrease the width by customizing the facility type to distinct areas.

a. ~~Decrease the width of the recommended route to 400 feet in order to accommodate a county road but not an interstate highway.~~

- Deleted: Reduce
- Deleted: reduce impacts to all categories.
- Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Strikethrough
- Formatted: Strikethrough
- Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Strikethrough
- Formatted: Strikethrough

Miscellaneous NO CONSENSUS, 4 THUMBS DOWN

CONCERN: IF YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO SPEND THE MONEY TO DO MORE, YOU DON'T DO MORE AND YOU GET INTO A VISCIOUS CYCLE WHERE NOTHING IS DONE. THERE IS PLENTY OF REASON TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT ENVIRONMENT, BUT IT DOES NOT MAKE SENSE ECONOMICALLY TO DELVE DEEPER INTO THAT AT THIS STAGE.

29 2. Incorporate an increased level of environmental information into the early design of alternatives to do a better job of identifying sensitive environmental features unique to the local community and understanding potential impacts to them, for example, Hill Country, Guadalupe River crossings, Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, Prime and Unique Farmland.

~~Do environmental studies early on.~~

a. ~~When TXDOT asks engineers to develop a transportation plan over environmentally sensitive areas such as here in our area, even in the earliest phases, much better environmental impact studies should be required (using contractors NOT related to the engineers or TXDOT) before proceeding with the rest of the design/study.~~

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Strikethrough

30	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i> DECISION TO REMOVE</p> <p>15. Sections A-F need to be ranked as to their importance and prioritized for development. At this point, those property owners need to be visited and allowed time to give feedback on what needs to happen to get their support.</p>	<p>Formatted: Font: 20 pt, Strikethrough</p> <p>Formatted: Font: 20 pt, Strikethrough</p>
31	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> DECISION WITH A STAND ASIDE BY THREE PEOPLE, WILLING TO LET PROPOSAL MOVE FORWARD.</p> <p>CONCERN: THIS IS REDUNDANT. THIS IS NOT ENFORCABLE.</p> <p>9. <u>Decision makers (elected officials, platting authorities, City & County staff, etc.) need to provide ample opportunity for community involvement concurrently with any additional changes for the Outer Loop.</u></p>	<p>Deleted: Our committee should encourage the d</p> <p>Deleted: to make community involvement mandatory</p> <p>Deleted: before</p> <p>Deleted: changes or decisions are considered for this</p> <p>Deleted: development</p>
32	<p><i>Screening Process</i></p> <p>4. The Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone and subdivisions should be included as criteria.</p>	<p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Strikethrough</p>
33	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> DECISION ON MOVE</p> <p>3. The public meetings should offer more opportunities for dialogue.</p> <p><u>c. MOVED BULLETS TO 10.</u></p>	<p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Strikethrough</p> <p>Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p>
34	<p><i>Constraints</i> DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>9. <u>Using appraisal district data quantify total agriculturally exempt acreage being affected as well as the parcels that are being divided.</u></p> <p>a. Note not just the parcels that are bisected, but also the total farmland acreage being affected.</p>	<p>Deleted: Have a better dialogue, not lectures.¶ Provide multiple maps at public meetings.</p> <p>Deleted: Note the</p> <p>Deleted: farmland</p> <p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p>
35	<p><i>Facility Type</i></p> <p>2. Customize right of way and facility design per area based on environmental conditions.</p> <p>a. Platting authorities should maintain the focus on sensitive areas, i.e., limited access over the aquifer/recharge/contributing zones.</p>	<p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p>

36	<p><i>Public Involvement</i> <u>DECISION ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>12. When a stakeholder individual, family, HOA, etc. is visited by TXDOT engineer reps. and given opportunities to voice concerns or to work out possible alternatives to be considered, <u>a follow-up communication</u> to the stakeholder/s should be made if none or few of their concerns are met before these persons are confronted by the changes at a public MAPO meeting.</p>	<p>Deleted: a follow up visit or at least a phone call</p>
37	<p><i>Need and Purpose</i></p> <p>4. Address need and purpose issues openly at the Preliminary Design Conference and at the following Press Conference, including all items listed in the Need and Purpose section above, especially Items #2 and #3.</p>	<p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p>
38	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i> <u>NO CONSENSUS, 10 DOWNS, 2 SIDEWAYS</u></p> <p><u>CONCERNS: GOING BEYOND CHARGE OF THE TASK FORCE. NOT NECESSARY. WOULD LIKE TO TAKE IT OUT BECAUSE IT IS NOT TRULY RELATED TO THE LOOP.</u></p> <p>3. <u>Decision-making bodies should obtain information or hold workshops for staff</u> regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. NEPA and Section 106 synopsis b. 1906 antiquities law and Texas antiquities laws to date c. Noise abatement d. Biological studies e. Hydrology studies 	<p>Deleted: Have more education and</p>
39	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>14. When the next phase begins, all officials involved in the Outer Loop should use each section as working points with appointed representatives from that section. Smaller groups will allow for fewer disruptions, more confidence and trust in leaders, and positive ownership on the part of the people affected by the loop.</p>	<p>Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Strikethrough</p>
40	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>8. Preserve resources like the Edwards Aquifer.</p>	<p>Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Strikethrough</p>

41	<p><i>Constraints</i> <u>DECISION MADE ON RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p>8. Constraints that should be evaluated beyond what the study considered.</p> <p>a. Disclose loss of acreage and buildings at proposed intersections.</p> <p>b. Add requirements to preserve quality of life, heritage and community values.</p> <p>c. Identify the boundary lines of properties affected by the Outer Loop that contain an unaffected building that is currently on the national register.</p>	<p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p> <p>Deleted: national registry eligible building</p> <p>Deleted: on that property.</p> <p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p>
42	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>18. Recommend that current roadways be utilized as much as possible to avoid the New Braunfels Outer Loop from becoming a toll way.</p>	<p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p>
43	<p><i>Public Involvement</i></p> <p>20. Better educate small property owners on the process and impact on their property.</p>	<p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p>
44	<p><i>Screening Process</i></p> <p>3. Screening criteria should not include "potential" factors that cannot be quantified.</p>	
45	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>7. Keep elected officials informed and visible at the public meetings.</p>	
46	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>20. Ensure that drainage easements are purchased and maintained as part of the loop construction.</p>	<p>Formatted: Highlight</p> <p>Comment [Y.D.5]: Move to list of concerns.</p>
47	<p><i>Public Involvement</i></p> <p>8. Use alternate/additional methods like Internet polls and mail-in surveys for gathering data on constraints from the community.</p>	<p>Deleted: Make sure that as the highway is being designed that flood control and drainage is a top priority.</p> <p>Formatted: Highlight</p> <p>Formatted: Strikethrough</p>
48	<p><i>Screening Process</i></p> <p>2. Make every effort to be consistent in explanations about reasons for changing the route in any of the sections in order that recorded statements made over time do not conflict, causing confusion or skepticism. (For example, c.f. Loop Study Report, 2008, West Side Modification 3.8.2, and minutes from Feb. 15, 2010 Task Force mtg.)</p>	
49	<p><i>Public Involvement</i></p> <p>2. </p>	<p>Deleted: Be sure to avoid community-wide events when scheduling public or committee meetings.</p>
50	<p><i>Constraints</i></p> <p>7. In those cases where the ranking of criteria is the same or very close, use the individual ranking for each criterion rather than considering only the aggregate number, especially when considering splitting properties.</p> <p>a. Look at the ranking from the various groups individually instead of the average.</p>	
51	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>4. Before the study is complete, all conflicts need to be addressed (stakeholders, environmental issues, historical, etc.)</p>	

52	<p><i>Public Involvement</i></p> <p>19. Recommend that all data, maps and announcements by TxDOT and its consultants be made public within a specific period of time (i.e.: 5 business days) of being created or discovered.</p>
53	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>5. Provide more specific (better defined) funding sources for completion of the study, later loop studies and construction.</p>
54	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>12. Recommend that we not add general recommendations away from what has been gone over.</p>
55	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>17. Sections A-F need to be ranked as to their importance and prioritized for development. At this point, those property owners need to be visited and allowed time to give feedback on what needs to happen to get their support.</p>
56	<p><i>Public Involvement</i></p> <p>5. Written information and someone to answer questions about right of way acquisition should be available at the public meetings. A designated table for the right of way information and several staff to answer questions is more appropriate later in the process than for this study.</p>
57	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>13. Someone from our group needs to get an answer from city officials that makes it clear who asked for this study in the first place. If no one did and an entity or group asked for it, we need to make sure our recommendation states this and is part of the screening process from this point forward.</p>
58	<p><i>Constraints</i></p> <p>5. Indicate the noise impacts outside the designated right of way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Disclose noise levels outside the 800-foot right of way. b. Identify a 300-foot buffer for noise.
59	<p><i>Constraints</i></p> <p>4. Explain the procedure for the compilation of ranking and weighing.</p>
60	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>19. Use eminent domain as a last resort. Try to negotiate fair settlement with property owners before starting legal proceedings.</p>
61	<p><i>Public Involvement</i></p> <p>18. Recommend that all data, maps and announcements by TxDOT and its consultants be made public within a specific period of time (i.e.: 5 business days) of being created or discovered.</p>
62	<p><i>Miscellaneous</i></p> <p>6. Have data and maps posted in public places for viewing.</p>

63	<i>Miscellaneous</i> 11. Find ways to acknowledge correspondence from stakeholders throughout the process.
64	<i>Public Involvement</i> 17. Ensure that all MAPO meetings open to the public meet the requirements of the Texas Open Meetings Act.
65	<i>Facility Type</i> 4. Landscaping is a must.

- Formatted: Highlight
- Deleted: Validate
- Formatted: Highlight
- Formatted: Highlight
- Comment [Y.D.6]: Move to concerns list.
- Formatted: Strikethrough