

**New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force
Meeting #7 (October 19, 2009): Comment Cards Tally**

A total of 9 Comment Cards were received.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
1.The objectives of this meeting were clearly articulated.		2	2	3	
2.The stated objectives for this meeting were met.			5	2	
3.I felt like my time was valued and utilized well.		1	4	2	
4.The speakers/presenters were well prepared and informative.		1	5	2	
5.I believe the topics were covered adequately in the time available.			5	2	

Comments:

- Please research and make available names of property owners where the route crosses the Guadalupe
 - Page 72 lists A26, A27 and A32 are eliminated due to residential impact – yet on A-3 A32 becomes the recommended route at the point it crosses SH 46. If it is 1100 ft when it crosses SH 46 it wipes out a large number of homes.
- I oppose the recommended route
- (1) Rationale for eliminating A-26 but having it still be represented on the map
 - (2) If you are going to discuss questions about A maps at the B meeting. When will discussions and resolutions be made as a GROUP regarding map A
 - (3) Mr. Rivera stated that he and “neighbors initially drew the actual highlighted section” could you provide us with the committee names that “drew” the circle?
 - (4) Mr. Rivera said that when they were originally drafting and researching, the questions about how to cross the river and I35 twice. My question is why even consider this? Why not start w/public opinion and comments? We know that this loop has been in existence for a long time. You all have just refined someone’s idea back in 1964. What happened to creativity?
 - (5) What philosophical entity did you derive your 5 fundamental principles? While you may have allowed for public input the public was not informed.
 - (6) With the new environmental studies being conducted on Alligator and Geronimo Creek what is Rivera’s response going to be when the findings are conclusive that this area is environmentally sensitive?
 - (7) Experts need to be experts and be prepared at all times to answer questions
 - (8) Announcements for the meetings need to be more clearly made to the public.
 - (9) City council needs to be advised to perhaps be apart of all of this creation discussion and meetings.

- How do private groups get the access that other communities have received. For example Rudy said that Lone Oak had a private meeting that extensively moved the line. How does Mission Hills Ranch get the same access.

The proposed route sends the road on the North side of a large development that already has 46 – 2722 interchange directly on one side of the development why has more development of roads been pushed down on another side of the development. Less than 1 mile from another large interchange.

- The facts presented do not agree with the maps and the time that has been spent on this has produced very little useable data. This is not a viable solution as it is environmentally unsound

Prop. 11 – 1st in domain

- Section A was not explained and addressed. As usual, meeting was so structured that the heart of discussing Section A was not really done.

(1) Who owns the property adjacent to the river by the 2nd crossing? (The 78 acres – just sold last year) i.e. which developer?

(2) We can not impact the Guadalupe River – too sensitive

(3) Who is presently building the “cloverleaf” at 46 and Mission Hills neighborhood?

- It appears that the meetings are being held just to communicate decisions already made based on criteria predetermined by the consulting team. 2) at the teams discretion the routes are added and dropped; 3) communication or reasoning of route changes are not clearly identified.

Please help me understand by addressing/answering the following:

1. What is the primary service the loop is to serve?

2. Why in the A, B,C area(s) specifically is the loop so close to the existing 337 loop? 1863? 2722?

3. Aren't these existing routes considered arterial routes & don't they serve a purpose that can be utilized to help elevate conjection in area(s) A & B specifically?

4. Does the City's plan have Hueco Spring loop in its arterial expansion plans?

5. If this is indeed the case & w/the future expansion of Highway 46 scheduled for the near future; isn't a loop that intersects where it is currently recommended a little short sighted?

6. The study seems to focus on being environmentally sensitive; help me understand how this can be; as the plan is to build & expand w/no regards to the environmental impact it will have on this area w/the existing & current future development planned for this area.

7. Simply stated; how is the loop going to perform in 20 years...will another loop be needed?

*Bottom line: Why is the loop so close in this area?

I have been to several meetings & no one has been able to answer this simple question.

Even though I have always been of the opinion that the proposed loop, as shown in the study is to close...I am even more concerned now as Route A10 – B1 were chosen & no-one could answer a single question. The loop in this area is closer to town than any other route (it would appear) & on top of this it is the area with the highest growth?

Are we being forward thinking enough? Are we truly considering