



**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORKSHEET
COMPILATION FROM MEETING ON MAY 18, 2009**

Comments from each group are indicated by the number of the group for each question. For example, Group 1 responses are indicated next to the number 1 for each question.

What stood out for you from the data?

1. Did a good job of getting the information about meetings out to the public. People knew about it but had concerns they weren't being listened to. Good job trying to garner participation and asking the right.
2. Good communication
People given adequate opportunity to express opinions/concerns
3. Made a large effort to tell us information without telling us the problem.
Data did not get to the public.
4. Repetitive with what was included in packets.
No mention of postponed or cancelled meetings and the lack of public notice of such.
5. Number of notices/public meeting - more than realized. More media coverage than realized.
6. Public comments - was tolerated but ignored
Public was tolerated but ignored
Opinions were not accepted
Factual information was accepted
Public comments were rejected because they [illegible] had been previously discussed.
No opportunity for public comments at certain meetings
TxDOT was not prepared and did not respond to public input.
7. Absence of [number of] comment cards from meeting data.
Lack of consensus for the loop.
What information from the public was considered the most important?

What surprised you?

1. The number of people in attendance at the meetings versus the small percentage of comments returned.
How approachable the group was.
2. Landowners not effectively notified
3. How much they say they communicated with the public but two in our group would be affected but were not notified.

4. Speaker stated that Comal Appraisal District database was used for public notice which conflicts with certain panel members were told previously.
5. Number of letters to editors – numbers of participants at meetings – reflects increased awareness and concern.
6. Seguin office did not have maps there were needed.
Seems like more meetings to me.
7. Blank

What concerns you about the public involvement process now that you have seen the data?

1. Maps weren't very legible online.
Only one map available at public meetings.
Communicate move with unaffected HOA's near the impacted areas to eliminate fears.
No options other than the outer loop? This led to the misconception that it was a done deal.
2. Didn't express need for loop effectively
Evaluation of other alternatives never effectively addressed
3. Appeared they were picky and choosy who they listened to or gathered info from.
4. Maps were not available on the website for public view in timely manner. Leaving too brief a time for public comment before final viewing date. (One day during a holiday)
Process was accelerated by 4 months without adequate explanation or notice.
A member reports that some members of the public did not receive notices although consultants had them on a mailing list.
5. Meetings were intimidating – more telling then listening. Lots of repetition of info.
6. Still not enough information.
7. Maps and data were not posted at public places for view.

What do you think was done well?

1. They were doing something right because the meetings grew as the process went on.
Good communication regarding what areas would be affected.
Ample time to view maps at public meetings.
Culled from 117 to 23 affected properties through the public involvement process.
2. Comprehensive program utilizing multiple media outlets
3. Lot of good graphics, maps, resources
4. Liked website information – useful.
Comprehensive in scope. Representative of the positives only.
5. Number of meetings – lots of opportunity to get info on proposal. Notices about meetings.
Feedback and info sharing on maps – was good.
6. Message boards were good.
7. There has been public involvement

What are some lessons that might be learned about public involvement from this data?

1. Use an official letter to notify the public via mail rather than a postcard that looks like an advertisement.
2. Blank
3. Talk with public not at public.
Meetings were set up without regard to community events.
4. Website did not allow public to respond in the email field.

5. Bring local politicians into process earlier in terms of speaking out about loop study and/or events that affect [the] whole county. More people might listen to their comments.
6. Certain property owners, after all of this, were still unaware of the process.
7. Need more info about why it is needed.
Some people probably did not fill out cards because they thought it was a done deal.

Based on what you learned, what recommendations would your group like to make regarding the public involvement process?

1. Continue with the path they are on – as we think it was good.
Provide multiple maps at the public meetings.
More official looking mailings.
Ensure open communication with elected officials to/from the public and environmental agencies, etc.
2. 1) More effective communication with property owners
2) Better communication of needs
3) Address alternatives up front
Stick to issues being addressed
3. Dialogue not lectures
Revisit meeting dates, maybe not always on Mondays
4. Task Force should be given summary and/or synopsis on NEPA and Section 106, 1906 Antiquities Law and all Texas Antiquities laws to date, noise abatement, biological studies and hydrology. Recommend 2 meetings regarding environmental issues.
5. Keep public officials in this Task Force process. More closely. More info to public on consequences of loop being built including tax issues, property valuations, environmental impacts.
6. Blank
7. People need to have better info and believe that people will take it seriously.