

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



	Agree	Disagree	No Comment
A total of 14 Meeting Evaluation Forms were received.			
1. The objectives for this meeting were clearly articulated.	11	1	1
2. The stated objectives for this meeting were met.	6	7	1
3. I felt that my time was valued and utilized well.	5	6	1
4. The handouts/presentations were appropriate and helpful.	10	4	1
5. The information from speakers/presenters was clear and informative.	4	8	2
6. The facilitator was well prepared and fair to all viewpoints.	8	4	2
7. The facilitator was helpful in framing the issues and process of the meeting.	8	4	3
8. I believe the topics were covered adequately in the time available.	2	10	1
9. There was sufficient time for public comment.	12	1	1
10. Task Force communications (i.e., materials, calls, logistics and other information) are being handled effectively.	10		3
11. The meetings are convenient and conducive to our work (i.e., meeting time, meeting length, location, audio visual, acoustics, overall meeting space).	9	2	3
12. The overall process that the Task Force is using is effective in bringing diverse views together to come up with recommendations for inclusion into the Draft Study Report.	6	3	3

Comments regarding questions (above):

Comment Card 4

Question 11: See #8 – Perhaps we need more time – at least 30 min. more

Comment Card 10

Question 8: Knew this was a multi month topic

Comments:

- The rules and regulations of Guadalupe Co. development were not obtained as asked at previous meeting.

Section D Questions

(1) What is the environmental impact of placing a road right next to the NB Garage Dump? How will this impact the underground runoff of the system?

(2) In the state of Texas, are there other roads built that close to a garage dump?

General

Why were the lines moved to not go directly through a subdivision, but the same method was not used when going through large farmland?

- Please give us maps that show actual land needed at interchanges so we can better see impact on land and homes –

- Farm and ranch areas are the basis of our great states wealth. We are shipping away this wealth asphalt by asphalt.

Was any weight given to the obvious – How long will a house remain vs. how long our land will be here

Why is the attendance by task force members declined

- Need to explain that the maps are a snapshot of status at the time the sector was evaluated and the routes changed due the interaction with other sector.
- Maps were confusing and not explained well. Will not recommend to proceed to B until A is well understood by public
- The consultants need to try having answers quicker. I know they can not remember everything but should be able to handle the questions. On the maps and the finding that were used or discussed. But all in all the consultants and facilitator doing a great job.
- Good to have discussion in small groups. I prefer more time in small groups.
- Can we have access to the MAPO meetings information for Lone Oak and the West Side modifications and East Side modification meetings for clarification on route changes

Be more flexible with time restraints for meetings

- Time is needed to answer most of the questions being asked. Do we need to extend meeting by 30 minutes to discuss comments and answer questions!
- 1) Access to Comal County's GIS site to verify home locations.
- 2) Access to an ELMO or Overhead Projector to present information that is not computer/web accessible
- 3) What is the specific explanation for what took place in the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study that state Rep. Kolkhorst of the Sunset Commission on TxDOT described as fraud on the part of TxDOT?
- 4) Specifically state the reasons in writing, with documentation to back up the reasons; why B-23 absolutely has to be used and take more houses in the A section?
- 5) This is the second request to obtain the Project Authorization document that is shown as complete in the "Project Initiation" phase of the Project Development Process, as previously requested in writing on August's Task Force Comment Card
- 6) Could TxDOT provide the task force with the criteria used to identify Environmental Justice populations with the supporting documentation? Please specifically identify those areas on a map of Sections A, B, C, D, E, F that are environmental justice populations, with supporting documentation.
- 7) How does the outer loop affect roads that it crosses, such as IH-35, Highway 46 and 306? How would those interchanges with these major roads impact areas and residences outside of the 450 foot width of the outer loop, when they measure approximately 3550 X 2250 feet? Please provide the task force with map overlays of these interchanges for sections A, B, C, D, E, and F.

8) Currently on the City of New Braunfels website is TxDOT's Comal County Corridor right of way preservation Map, could you provide the task force with this map and the equivalent map for Guadalupe County? What date was it made?

9) Why was the residence located at 4339 West Highway 46 not placed on the A section map until July 3, 2008; despite the owner having reported it to TxDOT five separate times? (1st time October 12, 2007, 5th time: April 2, 2008 at the New Braunfels Outer Loop Town Hall meeting).

10) Why is the residence located at 539 Elm Creek Road not located on the B-section map, despite TxDOT being made aware of it prior to the end of the study comment period?

11) Since the study has not been finalized, why is it not possible to change routes or language in the study to reflect the second Task Force's recommendations? Provide supporting documentation.

12) If the first New Braunfels Outer Loop Study was not flawed then why is there a second Task Force?

13) If TxDOT is not willing to change it's final recommendations in its final written report, despite the study not being finalized yet, then what is the purpose of the Second Task Force other than to "rubber stamp" TxDOT's previously flawed process leading to flawed recommendations?

- The opening presentation was somewhat repetitive. I realize members of the public who did not attend earlier meetings may not have heard this information before, but the committee cannot waste its very limited time re-hashing the same information for the benefit of the audience each week. The attempt at audio-visual presentation for the benefit of everyone is laudable, but may not be practical because the presenter needs access to multiple maps/documents at the same time to answer questions.

I do not believe Rudy was as prepared as he should have been for this important meeting. I have a suggestion to facilitate answering the committee's questions more readily at upcoming meetings about the screening process:

1. Set up a table or tables for Rudy and others to spread out the materials they need to access at the same time to answer the questions. (If the public cannot see everything on the screen at the same time, tough. The committee has work to do and the committee is supposed to have the materials with them.)
2. Use a three-person panel to address the questions. I would like to see Rudy, Cale (who is always well-prepared and has an excellent memory of facts and events), and Greg Malatek. Between the three of them, I am sure they can address all of the committee's questions as long as they have the ability to spread out and access the relevant maps and documents on a table in front of them

As an example, Tom Hornseth effectively answered a question for my small group by reference to three maps at once. He could not have done so as easily by using one map on the video screen. The presenters at future meetings will be more effective in addressing the complexity of the screening process if they can have all relevant materials at their fingertips.