

General Questions

From	Question	Response
<p>G-1</p> <p>(1 & 2) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ted West • Dolly Williams • Connie Krause • Martin Levett • Dean Word <p>(3&4) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bennie Bock • Gary Cobb • Marilyn Altwein • Karen Dietz <p>(5) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Dietz <p>(6) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Levett <p>(7) Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gene Sanders <p>(8) E-Mail: Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Dietz <p>(9) E-Mail: Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Levett 	<p><u>The following questions received pertained to interchanges.</u></p> <p>(1) Were the effects of major interchanges taken into consideration?</p> <p>(2) Were the effects of the major interchanges taken into account next to 300 homes vs a rifle range?</p> <p>(3) There is already an interchange on 46 – 2722 why is another needed less than a mile away</p> <p>(4) Why not show amount of land <u>actually</u> impacted by interchanges.</p> <p>(5) Please give us maps that show actual land needed at interchanges so we can better see impact on land and homes</p> <p>(6) 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.</p>	<p>(1&2) Yes. From a planning perspective the effects of major interchanges was taken into consideration. Chapter 8 of the study report documents those effects which identify ROW needs not only for the roadway under study, but also for the improvements that will be required at connecting roadways.</p> <p>(3&6) As depicted in the currently adopted New Braunfels Thoroughfare Plan, FM 1863 and FM 2722 are proposed to provide a high level of mobility and provide for local access while the outer loop is intended to provide a high level of mobility and connectivity with minimal access. Due to existing development across SH 46 from FM 2722, the feasibility of extending FM 2722 across SH 46 is minimal. It is not unusual to plan an expressway facility that distance from a lower level arterial.</p> <p>(4,5,6,8&9) Exhibits depicting the possible ROW requirements for the interchanges can be found in the study report. At this time, the study team can not provide information further than this because there is no facility type recommendation being made. The study team identified a corridor for a transportation facility but determining the facility type for future projects is not feasible and would require future study efforts.</p> <p>A possible task force recommendation could be to add exhibits to further clarify potential impacts at the crossings of major roadways.</p> <p>(7) Given the rapid development of the area in and around New Braunfels, it is not feasible to avoid developing a loop that is not in proximity of a subdivision. Moving the corridor recommendation will not eliminate this, just change affected parties.</p> <p>The Study Report states on page 53 that for planning purposes the study team assumed a three-level diamond for crossing SH 46 on the</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
	<p>(7) 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.</p> <p>(8) Why is there no indication of the amount of land needed for intersections at major roads where the outer loop crosses? Is it possible to show how facility types (parkways, major thoroughfares, etc) would drive the amount of land needed? This may or may not involve more than 800 ft ROW and would give public a more accurate picture of how land and residences, etc. would be impacted.</p> <p>(9) What is the potential impact at intersections along the routes? Since the types of recommended intersections are listed, why can't the consultants show how the possible impact of these intersections will appear on the maps?</p>	<p>East and the West with an Expressway 1 facility for the sole purpose of providing future designers “a guideline for determining whether sufficient ROW has been planned” (page 57 of the Study Report). The figures shown on pages 57-60 of the Study Report demonstrate the maximum impacts. It is possible that the impacts at this location could be further minimized, depending on the facility type that is recommended by future studies.</p> <p>Future traffic studies will be conducted to ensure that traffic operations and safety will meet the standards at the time of project implementation.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference: - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 8; Pages 52-60)</p>
<p>G-2</p> <p>Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ted West • Dolly Williams • Connie Krause • Martin Levett • Dean Word 	<p>Were the criteria consistently applied to all segments of the study?</p>	<p>Yes, NEPA requires and the study strived for a consistent application of the data and tools utilized during the study. Outside of NEPA requirements, there was no special consideration or preference given to any areas, populations or individuals.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference: - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Pages , 1, 3, 7, 13, 26, 36, 49 & 128)</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
<p>G-3</p> <p>(1) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ted West • Dolly Williams • Connie Krause • Martin Levett • Dean Word <p>(2) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donna Jones <p>(3&4) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Levett <p>(5) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alicia Herrera <p>(6) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Levett 	<p><u>The following questions make requests for upcoming Task Force meetings.</u></p> <p>(1) Can we get access to GIS at the Task Force Meeting?</p> <p>(2) Can we have access to the MAPO meetings information and the West side modifications and East side modifications for clarification on route changes.</p> <p>(3) Access to Comal County's GIS site to verify home locations.</p> <p>(4) Access to an ELMO or overhead projector to present information that is not computer/web accessible.</p> <p>(5) 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.</p> <p>(6) 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?</p>	<p>(1) The team has discussed with the Information Subcommittee the option of having GIS capabilities at the Task Force meetings. However, due to the logistical problems presented and the time GIS applications take there has not been a definite decision to take GIS to the Task Force meetings. Part of asking for questions on the sections includes being able to address specific concerns people may have and utilizing GIS to create exhibits that better explain the answer. If this does not suffice the subject can be addressed again.</p> <p>(2) This information is found on the CD containing the study reports. Copies of the full reports including all appendices and documentation are also located at the Seguin Public Library and the New Braunfels Public Library.</p> <p>(3) The City of New Braunfels' GIS Website is located at http://maps.nbtexas.org.</p> <p>Comal County also has a website for Online GIS access at http://www.cceo.org.</p> <p>(4) Currently the study team is not planning on utilizing this equipment. If there is interest in sharing information with the Task Force please submit a synopsis of the information to the Facilitator, Ms. Linda Ximenes, and the task force will be made aware of the information. If there is interest by the task force member to receive the information they will receive it. This procedure has been established and agreed to by the task force.</p> <p>(5) The option to extend meeting times was discussed with the information subcommittee and it was decided that the group would prefer to keep the meetings to the 2 hours allocated.</p> <p>(6) Need clarification about what the Comal County Corridor right of way preservation map is.</p>
<p>G-4</p>	<p><u>The following questions pertain to access to the study team.</u></p>	<p>(1&2) Property owners directly impacted by proposed modifications were invited to Meetings with Affected Property Owners (MAPOs). The</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
<p>(1) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bennie Bock • Gary Cobb • Marilyn Altwein • Karen Dietz <p>(2) Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gene Sanders 	<p>(1) 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?</p> <p>(2) 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.</p>	<p>general public was welcome to attend and observe the proceedings. If during the study’s efforts a group of affected property owners approached the study team to conduct a meeting the team did consider meeting with individuals as a group and one-on-one. During the study efforts no MAPO or individual stakeholder meetings were declined.</p> <p>Given the nature of the study and in accordance with the TxDOT Environmental Manual, TxDOT held a total of three meetings with affected property owners (MAPOs) to present proposed modifications that specifically affect those property owners and was not presented at the public meetings or the open house. At the MAPOs, affected property owners were given the opportunity to view maps of the modifications and provide their feedback on the alternatives.</p> <p>In addition to MAPOs the study team was contacted by numerous stakeholders including neighborhood groups to request a presentation as to the status of the study. The study team conducted over 11 individual stakeholder meetings during the course of the study.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 3; Pages 21-24) - MAPO Lone Oak Report - MAPO Eastside Revision Report - MAPO Westside Revision Report
<p>G-5</p> <p>(1&2) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bennie Bock • Gary Cobb • Marilyn Altwein • Karen Dietz <p>(3) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brett Reynolds • Arthur Brinkoetter • Marcie Helmke • Tom [Hornseth] • Maegan [Krueger- 	<p><u>The following questions received pertained to how homes/residences were utilized as a constraint.</u></p> <p>(1) How much weight does residence vs. other constraints actually impact final choice?</p> <p>(2) Why weren’t homes under construction shown on data?</p> <p>(3) Residential impact = ? homes</p>	<p>(1) The study team functioned under the assumption that none of the build options were perfect solutions and all had trade-offs that were the result of the balance between addressing needs and minimizing impacts. The study team did consider minimizing impacts to homes to be a high priority when considering alternatives.</p> <p>(2) Homes under construction were included if field verified and the platting process had been completed.</p> <p>(3) One home was counted as one residential impact.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 5; Chapter 6)

General Questions

From	Question	Response
<p>Blaschke]</p> <p>G-6</p> <p>Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brett Reynolds • Arthur Brinkoetter • Marcie Helmke • Tom [Hornseth] • Maegan [Krueger-Blaschke] 	<p>A more detailed explanation in table 19 would be helpful.</p>	<p>Table 19 in the Study Report itemizes the Section A Refined Universe of Options Screening. It was intended to work in concert with Figure 31.</p> <p>A possible recommendation could be to add more detailed explanations to the study report.</p>
<p>G-7</p> <p>(1) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brett Reynolds • Arthur Brinkoetter • Marcie Helmke • Tom [Hornseth] • Maegan [Krueger-Blaschke] <p>(2&3) E-Mail – Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Levett <p>(4) E-Mail – Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phillip Schulze 	<p><u>The following questions deal with historic constraints.</u></p> <p>(1) Historic resource impact means what exactly?</p> <p>(2) Why is the historic cemetery along Ewald road not shown on your maps when the information was given to consultants prior to the end of the comment period?</p> <p>(3) Please describe the protection of acreage surrounding historic homes. It is true that if a home is considered National Registry Eligible, the acreage surrounding it is protected from having a road planned though the acreage of the property? Please provide supporting documentation on this issue.</p> <p>(4) Why are historic properties not identified on the map?</p>	<p>(1) A historic resource impact could refer to an impact to a cemetery, archeological site, and/or historic site resulting from the location of the corridor alignment. The route recommended in the study has no historic resource impacts.</p> <p>(2) The possibility of a cemetery between Ewald Road and Link Road was brought forth at the June 26th 2008 MAPO. Connie Krause was notified immediately of a possible cemetery in this area and coordination with her continues in efforts to verify the existence and location of the cemetery. The existence of the cemetery has been corroborated by one other area resident but to this date its location has not been established or verified. Public input regarding constraint data had to be received and verified by July 7, 2008 to be incorporated in the August 2008 Final Study Report, which is why the possible cemetery is not included in the study report. The possible cemetery has been included in the study constraints data for future study purposes.</p> <p>(3) The TxDOT project planning perspective in compliance with Section 106, deals with historic (typically National Register-eligible) properties in their entirety, which typically are defined as the parcel or tract associated with the elements that make a property significant.</p> <p>In the case of a house in New Braunfels, that would typically mean the legal lot it sits on. In the case of a farmstead outside of town, that might mean the entire acreage historically associated with agricultural production if it's still operating as a farm. If the farm has been subdivided into different ownership or agricultural production has</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
		<p>ceased, we might devise an appropriate boundary in consultation with the THC based on the presence of character-defining historic elements such as the barn, sheds and a windmill to distinguish the significant parts of the property from the changed parts.</p> <p>It's that historic association that subjects the property to Section 106 regulations, not simple ownership. In the case of the farmstead example above, we would look at land historically associated with its agricultural operation during the historic period of significance (typically more than 50 years ago). Let's say, for example, that a 100-acre farmstead originally producing corn and cotton now serves as ranch headquarters for 1,000 acres amassed since the historic period. We would consider only the original 100 acres as the historic property if the buildings and fields were relatively unchanged. Otherwise, we might devise a smaller boundary focused on the intact farmhouse and barnyard in defining the National Register eligibility.</p> <p>In compliance with Section 4(f) regulations, we look at alternatives that avoid or minimize use of lands associated with historic properties. Sometimes we cannot avoid those impacts without affecting other environmentally protected resources such as wetlands or businesses or because engineering considerations render it imprudent to make the road swerve to avoid something while creating unsafe driving conditions. In that case, the regulations allow for minor uses of land (say a 10' swath across the front of a property) that avoid adverse effects to the character-defining elements. Historic setting may also be a consideration in such an example, which is something that would be worked out in consultation with the THC during a later stage of study.</p> <p>(4) Known historic properties are identified on the map (assuming the referenced map in question is one of the Recommended Corridor maps).</p> <p>Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 6; Pages 38-40) - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Appendix B: Registered & Potential Historic Sites)

General Questions

From	Question	Response
<p>G-8</p> <p>Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Folbre • Rod Smith • Rusty Brockman • Alicia Herrera • Dona Jones 	<p>Data supplied does not obviously support the conclusions – problem with the documentation</p>	<p>Documentation of the study process is an important step in recording what was done for the purpose of ensuring a fair and consistent process as well as for the posterity of the information in so far, as it is being utilized by future studies. If there are any specific recommendations that the task force would like to make to enhance how the study process is documented that would be a way of impacting future study efforts.</p>
<p>G-9</p> <p>(1) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Folbre • Rod Smith • Rusty Brockman • Alicia Herrera • Donna Jones <p>(2) Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerry Jernigan 	<p><u>The following questions generally referred to the facility type.</u></p> <p>(1) Upfront assumption concerning facility type (i.e. – freeway) limits the alternatives (geometry; ROW width)</p> <p>(2) Aren't these existing routes considered arterial routes, & don't they serve a purpose that can be utilized to help elevate congestion [sic] (<i>interpreted as 'alleviate congestion'</i>) in area(s) A & B specifically?</p>	<p>(1) The study did not attempt to determine a recommended facility type for the corridor but did identify a facility type in order to determine the right-of-way needs and design criteria for the corridor. Based on the recommended facility types, the study team recommended studying a corridor width of 800 feet which is what was used during the screening and evaluation process. Further, the study team recognizes that the 800-foot corridor provides sufficient flexibility to adjust the horizontal alignment of the 300 to 450 foot wide facility and further minimize potential impacts to properties.</p> <p>(2) Yes, these routes are considered arterial routes, and intended to provide a high level of mobility as well to provide access to abutting property owners.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 4: Need and Purpose for Improvement) - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 8: Design Criteria) - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 12: Study Recommendation; Pages 124-127)
<p>G-10</p> <p>(1) Worksheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Folbre • Rod Smith • Rusty Brockman • Alicia Herrera • Donna Jones <p>(2) Comment</p>	<p><u>The following questions generally deal with the process for which the different sections will be discussed at future Task Force meetings.</u></p> <p>(1) Will same types of issues/questions be raised for <u>B-F</u> segments as we found for <u>A</u> segment 10-19-09?</p>	<p>(1) The study team is currently taking questions on ALL SECTIONS of the study area.</p> <p>(2) The recommendations regarding Section A and the rest of the Sections have not been scheduled at this time. The study team is meeting with the Information Subcommittee to discuss possible options and will present to the Task Force for consideration.</p> <p>(3) Currently the November 30th meeting will review the process used for</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
<p>Card Stacy Graumel</p> <p>(3&4) E-Mail – Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Karen Dietz 	<p>(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</p> <p>(3) Will the Task Force members be able to see the Refined Universe of Options Screening Summaries for the remaining sections at our next meeting? If so, thank you. If not, why not?</p> <p>(4) Will there be adequate time to review the above documentation at our next meeting? Given the depth of interest and concern re: Section A, it would seem important to provide time even if it means extra meetings.</p>	<p>the screening of alternatives for all six sections utilizing Section A to demonstrate the process used to screen. The screening summaries are available in the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report and Appendices.</p> <p>(4) The original time commitment for the Task Force was scheduled to go until December 2009. A full work-day was added for January 9th to give the task force an opportunity to deliberate on recommendations after all of the information is presented. The team is currently talking to the Information Subcommittee and will also discuss with the Task Force the option of adding a meeting in January and pushing back the full-day workday to late January.</p>
<p>G-11</p> <p>(1) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anonymous <p>(2) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marilyn Altwein 	<p><u>The following questions generally deal with the weight of constraints for homes and farmland/open areas.</u></p> <p>(1) Why were the lines moved to not go directly through a subdivision, but the same method was not used when going through large farmland?</p> <p>(2) Was any weight given to the obvious – How long will a house remain vs. how long our land will be here?</p>	<p>(1&2) Before undertaking the evaluation of alternatives, the study team engaged the public in a discussion about local values and priorities related to the constraints. To do this, the study team presented fifteen (15) pre-identified Community and Environmental Goal constraints to the community and asked stakeholders to rank those constraints in order of importance. Input was solicited from participants at the Agency Coordination Conference (ACC), Public Meetings, and Community Work Group (CWG) to determine which constraints were most important to the local community. Participants were also encouraged to add other constraints they felt should be considered by the study team. The methods for analyzing the feedback from these groups and individuals as well as the results are described in detail in the following subsections. After the process was conducted the number one constraint identified by the community was homes.</p> <p>The study team did consider minimizing impacts to homes to be a high priority when considering alternatives, but “Minimizing Impacts to Farmlands/Ranchlands” as well as 30 other constraints were evaluated before making the final recommendation.</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
		<p>Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 6: Environmental Constraints) - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 7: Screening and Evaluation)
<p>G-12</p> <p>Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marilyn Altwein 	<p>Why is the attendance by task force members declined?</p>	<p>The Task Force Member attendance by meeting to date has been:</p> <p>Meeting 1 – 33 Task Force Members in attendance Meeting 2 – 32 Task Force Members in attendance Meeting 3 – 33 Task Force Members in attendance Meeting 4 – 30 Task Force Members in attendance Meeting 5 – 29 Task Force Members in attendance Meeting 6 – 23 Task Force Members in attendance Meeting 7 – 25 Task Force Members in attendance</p> <p>There are currently 39 active Task Force Members. Although we can not speak to the specific reasons for attendance we have heard from certain Task Force members that have decided to not participate that they have conflicts with meeting dates because of travel schedules, another previous task force member felt that they had missed meetings and were too far behind to catch up with the process.</p>
<p>G-13</p> <p>(1&2) Evaluation Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Levett 	<p><u>The following questions pertain to the reopening of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study.</u></p> <p>(1) 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?</p> <p>(2) If the first New Braunfels Outer Loop Study was not flawed then why is there a second Task Force?</p>	<p>(1) The study team can not speak to what specifically happened at the Sunset Commission Hearings since no person on the study team was present at the proceedings.</p> <p>(2) TxDOT cited concerns by the public which identified a need to go back and reexamine the process. For these reasons, the New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force was comprised of members of the original Technical Work Group and Community Work Group, as well as other stakeholders with expressed interest.</p> <p>An article in the Herald-Zeitung dated August 27, 2008 states that, “CASE Founders Dr. Martin and Sharon Levett attended the state’s Sunset Commission hearing in July and testified about problems they perceived with the proposed Outer Loop planning process. TxDOT Assistant Executive Director David Casteel requested a meeting with the Levetts, which prompted the study’s reopening.”</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
G-14 Evaluation Form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Levett 	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.	In regard to identifying areas of potential Environmental Justice areas the study team looked for concentrated minority populations and/or low income populations within the study area utilizing information from the US Census Bureau, public input and windshield surveys. A preliminary evaluation was conducted using US Census Bureau information. Further evaluation will be necessary in future phases. Approximately 5397 acres of potential environmental justice was identified within the study area. Reference: - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 6: Environmental Constraints; Page 42)
G-15 (1&2) Evaluation Form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Levett 	<p>The following questions deal with the <u>study recommendation and Task Force recommendations</u>.</p> <p>(1) Since the study has not been finalized, why is it not possible to change routes or language in the study to reflect the <u>second</u> Task Force's recommendations? Provide supporting documentation.</p> <p>(2) If TxDOT is not willing to <u>change</u> 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?</p>	(1&2) The New Braunfels Outer Loop Study and Report have been finalized. Recommendations from the Task Force to change the alignment, routes or language in the Study Report will be included with the Study Report to the City of New Braunfels and other communities impacted by the study area for their review and possible adoption into their planning documents.
G-16 Comment Card <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anonymous 	Please research and make available names of property owners where the route crosses the Guadalupe.	An exhibit has been created showing the property names of landowners along the Guadalupe River crossing in the study area during the course of the study. To receive a copy of this exhibit please send an e-mail to info@nbolstudy.com . The property owners will be notified of whom requests this information. Current property owner information can be obtained thru the Comal County Appraisal District.

General Questions

From	Question	Response
<p>G-17</p> <p>Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stacy Graumel 	<p>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?</p>	<p>Assume that the highlighted section referred to in this question is the study area which was originally developed by the study team. Once a Draft Study Area was developed, it was presented to the local community at the TWG Meeting #1, the first round of public meetings, and CWG Meeting #1. The feedback collected suggested that the study team needed to consider extending the study area further out to the north. After reviewing the level of residential development, challenges in crossing the Guadalupe River, and the rolling terrain north of the Draft Study Area, TxDOT and the study team decided to finalize the study area as it was originally presented to the community.</p> <p>Community Work Group - Name & Interest</p> <p><u>Guadalupe County:</u> Jeff Kraft - Resident, Property Owner TD Thomas - Resident, Property Owner Cheryl Fisher - Resident John Neely - Business (Airport Business) Silver State Helicopter Korvan Kreuzler - Farming/Ranching, 2nd Generation Self-Employed Farmer/Rancher Lorenz Bading - Farming/Ranching</p> <p><u>Comal County:</u> Eric Bergquist - Resident Vincent Schwab - Resident Arthur Brinkkoeter - Resident Sonia Munoz-Gill - Resident Curtis Timmerman - Resident Jim Reaves - Resident Rick Myrick - Resident Karen Dietz - (Pantermuehl Ranch) Resident Dave Bretzke - Resident Richard Cedillo - Resident R. Glenn Avriett - Farming/Ranching; Texas Cooperative Extension – Comal County, Emilee Trlica - Farming/Ranching; Texas Farm Bureau – Comal County</p> <p><u>Regional Growth:</u></p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
		<p>Belinda Reasor - City of Marion Councilwoman Larry Alexander - City of New Braunfels Planning & Zoning Commission Jim Folbre - City of Santa Clara Planning & Zoning Commission Eve Hiner - City of Seguin Planning & Zoning David Mueller - Mayor of Santa Clara Glenn Hild - Mayor of Marion</p> <p><u>School Districts:</u> Keith Phillips - New Braunfels ISD - Transportation Roy Linnartz - Comal ISD – Transportation</p> <p><u>Multi-Modal:</u> Scott Wood - Running/Walking Interest New Braunfels Running Club</p> <p><u>Historical:</u> Dolly Williams - Downtown Association, Frost Bank Darrell Sollberger - NB Conservation Society Laura West - Comal County Historical Society</p> <p><u>Economic Development:</u> Rusty Brockman - New Braunfels Chamber of Commerce</p> <p>Technical Work Group - Name & Organization Ted West - Federal Highway Administration Kirk Fauver - Federal Highway Administration Vicki Crnich - Texas Department of Transportation – ENV Judy Friesenhahn - Texas Department of Transportation Linda Blume-Grimsley - Texas Department of Transportation Joel Guerrero - Texas Department of Transportation Richard De La Cruz - Texas Department of Transportation Michelle Kopp - Texas Department of Transportation Jesse Hayes - Texas Department of Transportation Philip Howlett - Texas Department of Transportation Greg Malatek - Texas Department of Transportation Elvia Gonzalez - Texas Department of Transportation Valerie Collins - Texas Department of Transportation Rusty Brockman - New Braunfels Chamber of Commerce Thomas Hornseth - Comal County Larry Timmerman - Guadalupe County Gregory Webb - Guadalupe County</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
		<p>Jocelyn Murphy - City of New Braunfels Connie Krause - Consulting Party Status</p> <p>The list of attendees at the First Round of Public Meetings would be too long to include in this document. Rosters and sign-in sheets for attendees at these meetings can be found in the various study reports which are available for review at the New Braunfels Public Library, and the Seguin Public Library, TxDOT's New Braunfels Area Engineer's Office, the City of New Braunfels Planning Office, the Comal County Engineer's Office and the Guadalupe County Planning Office. The Study Report is available online at the project website at www.nbolstudy.com.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference: - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 2: Study Introduction; Pages 8-9)</p>
<p>G-18</p> <p>Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stacy Graumel 	<p>Mr. Rivera stated that when they were originally drafting and researching, the questions about how to cross the river and I35 twice my questions is why even consider this? Why not start w/public opinion and comments? We know that this <u>loop</u> has been in existence for a long time. You all have just refined someone's idea back in 1964. What happened to creativity?</p>	<p>The study was for a planned loop around the City of New Braunfels which necessitates the crossing of the Guadalupe River, twice as well as to refine the loop currently showing on the major thoroughfare plan. Considering where the corridor intersects with other major infrastructure features is important for the purposes of mobility, safety, engineering and feasibility. In addition to considering the built environment the study team also engaged in numerous public and other stakeholder involvement activities.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference: - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 2: Study Introduction; Pages 8-9)</p>
<p>G-19</p> <p>Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stacy Graumel 	<p>What philosophical entity did you derive your 5 fundamental principles?</p>	<p>These 5 principles were developed from the collective experience of the study team to help communicate to the Task Force the fundamental challenges of the screening process. These principles were presented to the Information Subcommittee for feedback prior to distribution to the Task Force and the public.</p>
<p>G-20</p> <p>Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sherry(?) Ruth(?) Wooley 	<p>Who owns the property adjacent to the River by the 2nd crossing? (The 78 acres – just sold last year) i.e. which developer?</p>	<p>The information that the study team gathered to identify property owners during the time the study was being performed is now several years old. More current information can be obtained from the Comal County Appraisal District.</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
G-21 Comment Card <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sherry(?) Ruth(?) Wooley 	Who is presently building the “cloverleaf” at 46 and Mission Hills neighborhood?	TxDOT is currently constructing what is more commonly referred to as a “diamond” interchange and not a “cloverleaf” interchange at the intersection of SH 46 and FM 2722. For additional information on this construction project please contact Laura Lopez at 210-615-5839.
G-22 Comment Card <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerry Jernigan 	What is the primary service the loop is to serve?	The purpose of the proposed corridor/loop concept is to: preserve and enhance regional mobility and connectivity; increase capacity of the transportation infrastructure, and preserve safety. <hr/> Reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 6: Environmental Constraints; Pages 26, 32-33)
G-23 Comment Card <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerry Jernigan 	Why in the A, B, C area(s) specifically is the loop so close to the existing 337 loop? 1863? 2722?	As stated on page 9 of the Study Report “The American Association of State Highways and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines state that urban principal arterials are recommended to be spaced between one and five miles apart. For the purpose of setting the study area, the study team looked to space the study area three to five miles from LP 337.” The study area was presented to the Community Work Group (CWG) and the Technical Work Group (TWG) for feedback. The study area was also presented for feedback at the first round of public meetings. See Section 2.2 of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report, Final (Study Report). As depicted in the currently adopted New Braunfels Thoroughfare Plan, FM 1863 and FM 2722 are proposed to provide a high level of mobility and provide for local access while the outer loop is intended to provide a high level of mobility and connectivity with minimal access. <hr/> Reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 2: Study Introduction; Page 9) - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 8: Design Criteria; Pages 52-60) - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 12: Study Recommendation; Page 124) - “City of New Braunfels 2005 Thoroughfare Plan.” City of New Braunfels

General Questions

From	Question	Response
		Comprehensive Plan. http://www.nbtexas.org/DocumentView.aspx?DID=1368
G-24 (1&2) Comment Card <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerry Jernigan 	<p><u>The following questions pertain to the City of New Braunfels' Thoroughfare Plan for Hueco Spring Loop and Highway 46.</u></p> <p>(1) Does the city's plan have Hueco Spring loop in its arterial expansion plans?</p> <p>(2) 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?</p>	<p>(1) Yes, the currently adopted New Braunfels Thoroughfare Plan shows Hueco Springs Loop Road as a future 90-foot arterial which would cross SH 46 approximately 1600-feet southeast of its current intersection.</p> <p>(2) In addition to Hueco Springs Loop Road, the currently adopted New Braunfels Thoroughfare Plan shows numerous other future improvements ranging from 60-foot collectors and arterials ranging from the 70-foot arterial to 220-foot loops.</p> <p>As intended and depicted in the Thoroughfare Plan, the Hueco Springs Loop Road is proposed to provide a higher level of local access (driveways) while the outer loop is intended to provide a higher level of mobility, connectivity and less access.</p> <p>The currently recommended outer loop crosses SH 46 approximately 1.8 miles northwest from the proposed realignment of Hueco Springs Loop Road. Page 9 of the Study Report states that, "The American Association of State Highways and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines state that urban principal arterials are recommended to be spaced between one and five miles apart." Therefore, it is not shortsighted to plan an expressway facility that distance from a lower level arterial.</p>
G-25 Comment Card <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerry Jernigan 	<p>Simply stated; how is the loop going to perform in 20 years...will another loop be needed?</p>	<p>The New Braunfels Outer Loop has been identified as a potential opportunity to add capacity to the existing transportation system in meeting long-term mobility needs. Future traffic and transportation studies will be needed to determine what portions, if any, of the loop become viable and necessary projects. These future studies will also determine if another loop is needed.</p>
G-26 E-Mail: Task Force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Dietz 	<p>What is the explanation for the inconsistent answers to the questions from Task Force members and the public about what is driving the need for an Outer Loop. Earlier, as documented in the first Final Report, we were told "it is NOT</p>	<p>As stated on the Glossary of Terms for the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study: Developer Driven is defined to be "...development takes place when a person, group or company invests in and develops a site for residential or commercial use causing and guiding the implementation of homes, retail areas and the infrastructure needs that accompany the development. Funds used for this type of development come from the</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
	<p>developer driven." Now we are told that it is, indeed, developer driven. Please explain?</p>	<p>investing party and not from the city or county. The developer works with the city and/or county to implement the project and follow the development process of the city/county."</p> <p>In stating that the preservation of right-of-way would be "developer driven" the understanding is that when a developer opts to proceed with a plan to either create a subdivision or develop a site for commercial use, the development itself will "drive" the acquisition of the right-of-way needed from that development to be designated and dedicated to accommodate for the future Outer Loop facility.</p>
<p>G-27</p> <p>E-Mail: Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Karen Dietz 	<p>How does the location of the GLO property impact the final route choices? Is the city working with TXDOT and its consultants to insure development of that property by locating the outer loop so it is advantageous to that developer?</p>	<p>The location of the GLO property had no impact on the final route selection other than undergoing the same evaluation process of constraints applied to all other routes. No, the City and TxDOT and its consultants are not locating the route in any way to be advantageous to a developer. As routes were refined and a draft study recommendation was identified, the study team did make an effort to work with large land owners to accommodate the proposed New Braunfels Loop in the most desirable location within their property, provided that the location did not adversely impact surrounding property owners and that impacts to constraints were minimized.</p>
<p>G-28</p> <p>(1) Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stacy Graumel <p>(2&3) Comment Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jerry Jernigan <p>(4) E-Mail: Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rusty Brockman 	<p><u>The following questions generally deal with environmental concerns.</u></p> <p>(1) With the new environmental studies being conducted on Alligator & Geronimo Creek, what is Rivera's response going to be when the findings are conclusive that this area is environmentally sensitive?</p> <p>(2) 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.</p>	<p>(1&3) The data collection efforts of the study utilized published data, aerial and field reconnaissance beginning in April 2007 through January 31, 2008. In addition to this data, public and other stakeholder input and feedback was collected and investigated through July 7, 2008, to identify constraints. Future studies would update the data collection efforts to possibly include the findings of these new studies.</p> <p>RJ RIVERA's response will be the same as it has always stated, that future phases will include further environmental studies, a detailed alignment and right-of-way level of analysis and continued public involvement. Future environmental studies would also consider indirect and cumulative impacts of options including the no-build option to determine the impacts of building something versus building nothing; each option has unique impacts to consider.</p> <p>(2) NEPA requires Federal agencies to consider environmental effects</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
	<p>(3) Are we being forward thinking enough? Are we truly considering the impact on the environment</p> <p>(4) The NBOL study has inadequately addressed significant environmental issues related to one of the most environmentally sensitive areas in the State of Texas - that of the Guadalupe River Road area.</p> <p>Section 1.7 Environmental Constraints “The study team utilized methods such as available aerial photography, published data and ‘windshield’ surveys to develop the environmental constraint maps utilized for the development of options and the screening and evaluation process.”</p> <p>Since significant information, readily available by the methods described above, was left out of the report; one can only conclude that inadequate research was conducted. Consider the following: Signs along River Road placed by the Edwards Aquifer Authority clearly state that the River Road area is environmentally sensitive because of the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, the water source for over one million Texans including the City of New Braunfels. Signs of warning placed by the Water Oriented Recreation District (WORD) of Comal County at the New Braunfels and</p>	<p>that include, among others, impacts on social, cultural, and economic resources, as well as natural resources. The New Braunfels Outer Loop Study was the first part (planning study) of a multi-phase approach in the development of the outer loop. The study evaluated, from a planning standpoint, the impacts of the proposed corridors (Shortlist Options) on 31 constraints.</p> <p>(4) The New Braunfels Outer Loop Study was never intended and has never claimed to be a full, comprehensive environmental assessment. The Study conducted the necessary planning and analysis needed to identify a corridor for the possible development of a New Braunfels Outer Loop. Future phases will focus on refining portions of the loop that can act as stand alone projects where needs have been identified. Those portions of the planning process will concentrate on the development of detailed environmental documents which will consider alternatives within and beyond the 800’ corridor defined. The environmental document classification for future projects will be based on the significance of the environmental impact of each portion.</p> <p>From the Texas Parks and Wildlife Website: “The Texas legislature may designate a river or stream segment of unique ecological value following the recommendations of a regional water planning group. As per 16.051 (f) of the Texas Water Code, this designation solely means that a state agency or political subdivision of the State may not finance the actual construction of a reservoir in a specific river or stream segment designated by the legislature under this subsection.”</p> <hr/> <p>Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 2: Study Introduction) - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 5: Data Collection) - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 6: Environmental Constraints)

General Questions

From	Question	Response
	<p>Sattler ends of River Road clearly indicate that the area is environmentally sensitive.</p> <p>The State of Texas through the Texas Administrative Code Title 31 357.8 deems the River Road area to be an Ecologically Unique River and Stream Segment.</p> <p>The National Park Service has designated the Guadalupe River as the #2 scenic river in Texas.</p> <p>On October 16, 2009, in a conversation with the lead engineer for this study, he was not aware that the River Road Area had these designations and/or if there was legislative protection.</p> <p>So when the report indicates that there are 'potential sensitive geologic areas' that is not accurate. The Guadalupe River Road area is clearly defined by the State of Texas, Comal County, the Edwards Aquifer Authority and the National Park service as being environmentally sensitive and special.</p> <p>Should not further research be completed to determine if there are any additional environmental constraints before proceeding with any route decision?</p> <p>In a conversation on October 7, 2009, the Texas Parks and Wildlife biologist for</p>	

General Questions

From	Question	Response
	<p>Region L (which includes Comal County) said her Department had not been informed of the NBOL study.</p> <p>Considering the environmentally sensitive nature of this area, when a multi lane freeway overpass is being proposed over 2nd Crossing on River Road, why wasn't Texas Parks and Wildlife notified of this plan, especially since public meetings were held?</p>	
<p>G-29</p> <p>E-Mail: Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharon Levett 	<p>The maps the task force are being given are not the same as the maps on the NBOL Study website. Why are the maps distributed to the task force updated and do not contain the same information (platting etc,) used to determine the routes?</p>	<p>The study team created new exhibits in an effort to provide the Task Force with the best information at its disposal. There was intent to keep the same information as what was evaluated during the course of the study. One example of changes made include the exhibits that were created to show the options at each level of screening. The study team added the study recommendation to each of these exhibits. Unfortunately this has also had the consequence of causing much confusion.</p> <p>If there are specific instances where differences between the maps/exhibits used by the Task Force are not consistent with what was used during the study please bring that to our attention.</p>
<p>G-30</p> <p>E-Mail: Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharon Levett 	<p>In article dated November 9, 2007, RJ Rivera Associates decided to “postpone a series of meetings intended to give the local community a voice in the planning process” and then on Friday, December 7, 2007 a News Release was sent out by TxDOT stating that the “ New Braunfels Outer Loop Study will present the recommended route in January 2008, four months earlier than the original date of May 2008” and “present the recommendation to the City of New Braunfels and Comal and Guadalupe Counties in February”. According to the</p>	<p>TxDOT indicated that the incredible amount of data collected from the two rounds of public meetings, six technical and community work groups, and numerous stakeholder meetings had afforded the study team the ability to deliver the recommended route within an earlier timeframe.</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
	<p>November article: “no explanation was given for the postponement”, and Linda Vela was quoted as stating “This is a complicated project and there has to be a time for the consultants to do their work”.</p> <p>If more time was needed, why was the final route recommendation accelerated by four months and presented to the public in January 2008 instead of the planned timeframe of May 2008?</p>	
<p>G-31</p> <p>(1,2&3) E-Mail: Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Levett 	<p><u>The following questions deal with the documentation of meetings.</u></p> <p>(1) Why do we not have documentation of stakeholder meetings between TxDOT/RJ Rivera and the County Judge or County Commissioners regarding the location of these routes?</p> <p>(2) Where is the documentation for stakeholder meetings that created the route change and the MAPO meeting for Section C?</p> <p>(3) It has been stated that there were 2 meetings with Pedernales Electric/LCRA to discuss the possibility and challenges of moving the power lines along FM2722. Where is the documentation on this?</p> <p>(3) RJ Rivera has stated there was another large meeting prior to the ACC meeting where it was discussed that the freeway plan would be best for this study.</p>	<p>(1) The New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report encompasses and documents the efforts of the study team. It does not document meetings or conversations held outside of the study boundaries.</p> <p>(2) Public comments during the Open House identified a new residential development which led to MAPO #2. With the property owners consent, the team conducted field reconnaissance to verify the existence of the home in question. Whenever field reconnaissance was done for the study there was no official documentation included in the report.</p> <p>(3) One of the meetings held with LCRA is documented in a stakeholder meeting report. The second meeting was held between a sub-consultant on the team and a number of utilities in the area (AT&T, Center Point Energy, CPS Energy, Crystal Clear Water Supply Company, Enterprise Products, Guadalupe Valley Telecommunications Corp., Lower Colorado River Authority, Level 3 Communications, New Braunfels Utilities, P2 Energy Solutions, Pedernales Electric Cooperative) to collect utility information. This report is titled “Utility Research Report & Data” dated January 2008 and is available if requested.</p> <p>(4) A Preliminary Design Conference was held February 26, 2007, to inform agencies early in the process and to assure the phased approach was an agreed upon method to develop the loop and subsequent environmental documents for stand alone portions of the proposed outer</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
	Why don't we have minutes/ documentation on this meeting with the study report?	loop. Attendees at this meeting included TxDOT SAT, TxDOT Environmental Division, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Because this meeting was considered to be separate from the study efforts, documentation is not included as part of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study reports.
G-32 E-Mail: Task Force • Sharon Levett	What was the role of Valerie Collins and Judy Friesenhahn with the NBOL study? What are the specific reasons they are no longer employed by TxDOT and/or working with this and the 281/1604 project?	Ms. Judy Friesenhahn was the TxDOT Project Manager for on the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study. Ms. Valerie Collins was a subject matter expert in Environmental/Biology. The study team is not in a position to be aware of or comment on the specific reasons for these two individuals no longer being employed by TxDOT and/or working with this and/or the 281/1604 project.
G-33 E-Mail: Task Force • Sharon Levett	Since the movement in the B section created the movement in the A section and therefore takes a greater number of homes in the A section, why didn't the MAPO meeting on November 15, 2007 include the stakeholders in the A section including the numerous homeowners in Mission Hills Subdivision who now have the proposed route along the back of their properties?	<p>Property owners who were directly affected were sent an invitation to the Meeting of Affected Property Owners (MAPO) meeting held November 15, 2007, at Lone Oak School. This invitation was also published in the local newspaper for those new property owners who were inadvertently not sent invitations due to their exclusion in the appraisal district records.</p> <p>The study team tried to evaluate newly proposed routes versus routes that were previously presented. The routes in Section A had been previously presented and therefore a MAPO was not held with the Section A property owners.</p>
G-34 E-Mail: Task Force • Martin Levett	In the Outer Loop study it states: "In order to reduce the Viable Options down to the Short List of Options, the study team evaluated the crossings at IH 35 and the Guadalupe River to determine which corridors would work best at each crossing". Why then did the Short list of Options B Section corridors increase to 27 from 22, instead of being reduced as stated? Why were these added at all when there was absolutely no impact on this portion of the B section by IH 35 nor the Guadalupe River?	<p>The general approach of the evaluation was to analyze the various corridors and drop those that did not compare favorably, eventually identifying the one corridor that best met project goals with less impact, based on the criteria. This was not necessarily a linear process because previously eliminated options could be reintroduced if new information was discovered that affected a prior action. Therefore, all steps of the study and information presented through the public involvement process were described as preliminary and to be evaluated further throughout the duration of the study.</p> <p>The Viable Options did include 22 options that were presented at the Second Round of Public Meetings. Based on feedback received at those meetings and subsequent reevaluation by the study team a new option,</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
		<p>B23, was introduced to help minimize impacts to potential environmental justice populations in the vicinity of the Lower Colorado River Authority (LCRA) transmission line, potential sensitive geologic areas, and the 100-year floodplain (see page 85 of the Study Report). In order to provide a connection between various other routes, B24, B25 and B26 and B27 were added to allow connection between B23 and other options. This brought the number of options at the Refined Viable to 27.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference: - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 2: Study Introduction)</p>
<p>G-35 E-Mail: Task Force • Phillip Schulze</p>	<p>Why was the Bandit golf course protected? It is private.</p>	<p>The Bandit golf course was not “protected”; however, the platted area of the Long Creek subdivision, which includes The Bandit golf course, is shaded as a Residential Subdivision as indicated in the map legend.</p>
<p>G-36 E-Mail: Task Force • Phillip Schulze</p>	<p>Why are parcels larger than 50 acres not identified on the map?</p>	<p>The reason for not identifying parcels larger than 50 acres on the map is because the maps became too clustered. Not all of the constraints were identified on the maps to try to retain clarity. There is a layer in GIS that identifies parcels larger than 50 acres which is what was used to quantify the impacts of each alternative on the matrix.</p> <hr/> <p>Reference: - Final New Braunfels Outer Loop Study Report. (Chapter 6: Environmental Constraints)</p>