



**NEW BRAUNFELS OUTER LOOP TASK FORCE
EIGHTH MEETING
NOVEMBER 30, 2009
NEW BRAUNFELS CIVIC CENTER - BALLROOM
6:00 - 9:00 P.M.**

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

<p>TxDOT REPS: Jonathan Bean, PE Greg Malatek, PE Laura Lopez Maggie Rios</p> <p>ELECTED OFFICIALS: Jay Millikin, Comal County Commissioner</p>	<p>TASK FORCE MEMBERS:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Arthur Brinkkoetter</td> <td>Phillip Schulze</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dolly Williams</td> <td>Rod Smith</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Donna Jones</td> <td>Roy Linnartz</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Karen Dietz</td> <td>Shannon Mattingly</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marcie Helmke</td> <td>Suzy Collins</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marilyn Altwein</td> <td>Tipton Ross</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rusty Brockman</td> <td>Tom Hornseth</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ted West</td> <td>Vincent Schwab</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bennie Bock</td> <td>Martin Levett</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brett Reynolds</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cheryl Fisher</td> <td>In attendance but not signed in:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Connie Krause</td> <td>Maegan Blaschke</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dean Word</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jim Folbre</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kevin Lehman</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lenny Llerena</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mitchell Sacco</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Arthur Brinkkoetter	Phillip Schulze	Dolly Williams	Rod Smith	Donna Jones	Roy Linnartz	Karen Dietz	Shannon Mattingly	Marcie Helmke	Suzy Collins	Marilyn Altwein	Tipton Ross	Rusty Brockman	Tom Hornseth	Ted West	Vincent Schwab	Bennie Bock	Martin Levett	Brett Reynolds		Cheryl Fisher	In attendance but not signed in:	Connie Krause	Maegan Blaschke	Dean Word		Jim Folbre		Kevin Lehman		Lenny Llerena		Mitchell Sacco		<p>CONSULTANTS:</p> <p>Ximenes & Associates, Inc. Linda Ximenes</p> <p>Kennedy Consulting, Inc. Kevin Kennedy, PE Tony Estes</p> <p>RJ RIVERA Associates, Inc. Rudy Rivera, PE Linda Vela Yobana Diaz Freddy Rivera</p>
Arthur Brinkkoetter	Phillip Schulze																																			
Dolly Williams	Rod Smith																																			
Donna Jones	Roy Linnartz																																			
Karen Dietz	Shannon Mattingly																																			
Marcie Helmke	Suzy Collins																																			
Marilyn Altwein	Tipton Ross																																			
Rusty Brockman	Tom Hornseth																																			
Ted West	Vincent Schwab																																			
Bennie Bock	Martin Levett																																			
Brett Reynolds																																				
Cheryl Fisher	In attendance but not signed in:																																			
Connie Krause	Maegan Blaschke																																			
Dean Word																																				
Jim Folbre																																				
Kevin Lehman																																				
Lenny Llerena																																				
Mitchell Sacco																																				

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 evening in a detailed format. 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 eighth meeting of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force shortly after 6:00 PM. She welcomed those in attendance and thanked them for being there.

Agenda Item II: Introductions

Ms. Ximenes stated that since the Task Force had asked to save time on things that are repeated at each meeting the introductions would be skipped since people should be familiar with other Task Force members by this point.

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

Ms. Ximenes reviewed the charge of the Task Force.

Agenda Item IV: Review the Desired Results of the Meeting

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

- Get acquainted with the Task Force members and their interests
- Review the screening process, using Section A as an example.
- Walk through two to three priority questions from those already answered in writing.
- Provide another opportunity to identify questions on the screening process regarding Sections C, D, E and F and prioritize two to three questions to be reviewed and discussed.
- 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.

Ms. Ximenes shared with the Task Force her plan for the recommendations that have been made during the small group work the Task Force has conducted at each meeting. She said she would create a "Consent Agenda" which would break the recommendations into three tiers. One tier would be recommendations that she anticipates would require the least amount of discussion and the other two levels would contain recommendations that might require further dialogue. The top tier would be recommendations that would require the most discussion. She stated that the recommendations would be included with the study report as an addendum. She stated that the consensus process included an option to "stand aside" which would mean that consensus is achieved but there are concerns held by some members of the Task Force. If the members with concerns opt to "stand aside" to allow a recommendation to achieve consensus, the concern expressed by the Task Force member will be attached to the recommendation going forward.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the meeting tonight would utilize section A as an example of how the screening process was used for the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study. She said the Task Force would also work to identify two to three priority questions to discuss further. She stated that questions for Sections C, D, E & F were requested at the last meeting but few were received so there would be an opportunity to ask questions on those sections as well. Those questions would be prioritized for further discussion at the upcoming December meeting. The rest of the questions would be answered in writing.

Martin Levett stated that at the last meeting questions were submitted in writing to be responded to in writing and that those questions would be discussed at the upcoming meeting. Dr. Levett stated that the agenda was not what was agreed upon at the last meeting. He said he felt that following the agenda as proposed this evening basically resulted in a call to close the Task Force without properly being allowed to complete the Task Force's charge. He proposed to go back to what was discussed at the last meeting and answer all of the questions in an open forum and go through that process for the remaining sections. Ms. Ximenes responded there was a limited amount of time for the Task Force to complete all of that work. Dr. Levett commented that the process had allowed the Task Force to waste time on policy, procedures and reviews that had taken time away from the Task Force reviewing the data. Ms. Ximenes reminded him that the questions had all been answered in writing. She said that if there was any clarification or questions on the responses submitted in writing then that could be a priority question.

Karen Dietz asked what the schedule of meetings was dependent upon. Ms. Ximenes said that part of it was budgetary constraints. Dr. Levett asked if questions would be taken on Section B which was left off of the agenda. Ms. Ximenes stated that questions on Section B were asked at the previous Task Force meeting and had been responded to in writing. She stated that if the group chose the B Section questions as their priority then those are the questions that would be discussed. Dr. Levett stated that if the group did not look at the B section and talk about it, he proposed that the Task Force should not endorse the study. Mrs. Ximenes stated that if the questions on Section B were chosen as the priority questions then those would be discussed with the whole group.

Dr. Levett proposed that the Task Force start where they left off in the A section with the experts answering our questions in an open forum and discuss the answers section by section. Ms. Ximenes asked for comments on the proposal. Mrs. Dietz asked if the group discussed the separate sections if the handouts distributed for Section A and B would be available for the remaining sections. Ms. Ximenes stated that was one of the reasons the Task Force was asked to bring their study report because that information is all in there.

Tipton Ross asked for clarification on the discussion whether to follow the agenda and the proposal that was made. Ms. Ximenes reviewed the agenda she prepared for the meeting and how she had designed the meeting structure. She noted that the difference from the agenda submitted was different from the proposal made was that each question would not be discussed question by question since that would take a very long time. Her goal was to get representative information from each section and get an overall idea of the process without having every question discussed. They would all be answered in writing for the Task Force members.

Mrs. Dietz commented that it was difficult to sign-off on the work done for the study without carefully examining each section. Mrs. Ximenes reiterated that each section would be addressed and questions would be answered in writing, they would just not be discussed in the Task Force meeting and reviewed one by one.

Mrs. Ximenes took a temperature on the proposal. The proposal was to start where they left off in Section A and discuss each question that had been submitted. Rudy Rivera pointed out that the responses given in writing were the facts of what the team did to prepare the study and make their recommendation on the route.

There was clarification by Tom Hornseth who asked if the plan was to review each question from the 12 sheets and go over each question one by one with the group. Dr. Levett stated that it would depend on whether there was a general consensus that the response submitted in writing was sufficient.

Phillip Schulze asked if there would be an opportunity to ask follow-up questions. Ms. Ximenes stated there would be an opportunity to ask clarifying questions.

Ms. Ximenes asked what it would take for those with their thumbs sideways to vote for the proposal. Rod Smith stated that at the Information Subcommittee they reviewed the draft responses to the questions and had hours of discussion over each section without getting through very many questions, which is why the idea of having priority questions seemed more reasonable.

Cheryl Fisher stated that the audience in attendance should have the benefit of the discussion on each question.

Dr. Levett stated he was fine with modifying his proposal to include only questions that required further clarification.

There was a concern expressed that if the group began to review each question one by one to see which questions required further discussion, it would result in each question being discussed. Mr. Ross stated that half an hour of the meeting had already passed and no decision had been made. There was a statement of concern over voting for the proposal even with the modification because there are members of the Task Force that would have issues with each of the questions responded to in writing and would result in a debate on each question.

Ms. Ximenes took another temperature on the proposal with modifications. She stated that consensus was not reached.

Dr. Mitch Sacco suggested going forward with the process and coming back to the issue. There was a suggestion to proceed with the agenda as laid out and if there are additional questions afterward they would be addressed then. Mr. Smith suggested taking a temperature on that proposal.

Meagan Blaschke stated she felt two to three questions were insufficient to address the different questions on all the sections. She stated that their charge was to review the entire study and that it does not seem reasonable to have that done by selecting three questions. She asked how three questions- that number- had been decided upon. Ms. Ximenes stated she had thought three questions would be what there would be time to discuss. Ms. Blaschke referred back to Mrs. Dietz's concern about the schedule not allowing sufficient time to review the process.

Mr. Schulze gave the new proposal a thumbs down and stated that he was not satisfied with the responses to his questions, so he would like the opportunity to review each question. He pointed out that the written response states the recommendation has no historical impacts and he did not believe that to be true.

Connie Krause stated that she had a thumbs down to the proposal because she had an issue with only selecting three questions. She stated it would be helpful to see Mr. Rivera's presentation before deciding on the course of action because it could open people's eyes.

Ms. Fisher stated she was thumbs down because she wants to make sure the Task Force does not leave a stone unturned for the people in the community not just for those on the Task Force.

Mrs. Ximenes asked if those with their thumbs down would be willing to stand aside to proceed with Mr. Rivera's presentation. She pointed out that the group would see the presentation before deciding on the course of action in proceeding with how much to discuss the questions for the sections.

At that point, the group returned to the sequence as indicated in the agenda.

Agenda Item VI: Approval of the Minutes from October 19, 2009

Ms. Ximenes asked for any corrections to the meeting minutes from October 19, 2009. There was a correction that Benny Bock and Brett Reynolds should have been listed as attendees.

Dr. Levett stated there was a comment from the public given by Ms. Graupner and her written testimony was not the same as what she said where she asked specifically if the public comments would be discussed at the next meeting.

With these changes the minutes were approved.

Dr. Levett stated that the project authorization document he had requested had not been received. Ms. Ximenes stated that would the document would have to come from TxDOT and that she would discuss the issue with him at the end of the meeting. Dr. Levett stated that part of TxDOT's role is to provide the technical support and background information necessary for the Task Force to make informed decisions and stated he would like to see the document.

Agenda Item VII: Comments from the Public

Rittler Strachan

[From Rittler Strachan] "I'm a registered nurse. I've been in healthcare for over thirty years and I am concerned about people's healthcare and their happiness. I don't have any anger. I don't have any blame. It's not productive. I'm not against Rivera & Associates; they have gone through an awful lot to produce all this rhetoric. But what I am experiencing is shock and grief. That's why I am like this. Like as a preventable, insensible, impending wound to an execution of an old friend. My sons, twelve and sixteen, and I kayak the Guadalupe River from the dam to 1st crossing, over ten miles. We have done fifty in the last year at least. It was pitifully easy for me to point out into that shallow water the algae and the silt and the degradation to the Guadalupe River which became more pervasive and more pandemic as we went down the stream and this is only under light development. I used to scuba dive and do the clean up in the river in total darkness

because there was so much silt in the bottom of the river I couldn't see anything while collecting those cans. My kids were awestruck by the beauty of the river and it is truly sensational. They were also astounded by the lack of effort of any erosion abatement along the river by any land owner. Cypress trees are dying and not being replaced; collapsed banks; a river soon to be in a box. They won't even go into the Comal anymore because it is a sick little river that is already in a box. Contrast to helping the most significant and magnificent polluter of waterways of all time will be this big roadway and with it the poorly planned, environmentally insensitive development that will come with it. It's the Spanish Inquisition. You know they are going to buy this. They are going to render their saber through the heart of our hill country; the recharge zone; the river. For fifty years while I am enslaved to pay to ride on that road that really, we have already paid for. There through that wound will go the developers and they will cut the golden egg right out of that goose and leave that thing done. We don't know that TxDOT has any idea what impact this will have on the aquifer. I can see it in the river, I can't see it in the aquifer. They are not qualified to look and they have said, they aren't going to look. They are not interested. You drive everywhere now, you know what I mean. And so you have to drive everywhere because they make these developments so that you have to drive. Oh, I need a beer I have to drive. I need Tylenol I gotta drive. I can't get anything like I could maybe at Town Creek the way they are thinking. So for no reason have they bothered to poll the citizens to see what they thought about this road and whether we needed it. And you know why, because they know that we'll see it for what it really is. A toll road, a thru-way, a development bonanza where our air and water are sold out for a buck. This is not for us citizens who live here now. This is TxDOT politely asking what bodily orifice that they should shove this road up. The sleeping giant has already awakened recently to address issues. Let's not summon this giant. By the way it's taking notes."

Frank Dietz

[From Frank Dietz] "I appreciate being able to speak and look at the Task Force members instead of your backs which is too often the case. My concern, particularly after listening to the early part of this evening's discussion is that the process has been exceedingly messy. As a person who also professionally does facilitating, I am appalled at the amount of invested time that you folks put in sitting at these uncomfortable tables defining the process, defining consensus and what have you. You have wasted these folks time madam, as well as the others who have orchestrated these processes for both the first Task Force and now this one. But my primary concern is that you find a way in your very measured, contrived agenda that seems to govern the way these groups come together time and again, to take significant account as Task Force members for the way that citizens in this community have expressed themselves again and again. Look at these documents in both the written and spoken comments. Over 95 percent; overwhelming participation by people should not be dismissed. It is not simply a matter of tweaking technical stuff. You can do that for years yet to come. The community, instead of being enhanced and strengthened, instead of bringing it together, is being divided and will be significantly broken environmentally and as a community of people for their future and so I would beg of you, do not in the next few weeks sign on to giving your own community imprimatur to what some very selfish interests have projected for our children and our children's future. It's an abomination."

Agenda Item VIII: Address Concerns and Comments Regarding the Screening Process

Handouts: This agenda pertains to the questions and responses on the General Questions and Section Specific Questions. Also refers to the *Study Process Timeline Diagram*.

Identify two to three priority questions from the questions answered in writing to be reviewed and discussed.

This portion of the agenda was put off until after the presentation on the screening of Section A by Mr. Rivera.

Review the General Process for Screening the Routes Using Section A as an Example

Mr. Rivera began by pointing to the Study Process Timeline Diagram. He stated that the process being outlined for Section A was also done for each of the sections of the loop. The screening undertaken was a seven-phase-process that evaluated different constraints at each level. As the process continued, additional data and constraints were added. For the final screening, from the shortlist to the recommendation, the full

matrix of 31 items was used. The early process was more qualitative and became more quantitative as it progressed.

He started with the study area and said the first route line added to the study area was the currently adopted New Braunfels Outer Loop. From here the Community Work Group, Technical Work Group and participants in the first round of public meetings, added lines to the Universe of Options. The Technical Team also added options and adjusted lines. Mr. Rivera went thru the process using a PowerPoint presentation. He explained one line was moved down to stay on existing roads and miss impacting a large residential subdivision. The study team also got input to stay "out" as far as possible. This was done by the study team who also drew a line in the closest part of the study area. Other feedback asked the study team to minimize splitting large parcels. Some options at this level were eliminated due to having those types of impacts. There were other possible routes removed due to lack of operational advantage over other options. The study team also identified trends at this point and lines that were very close were merged with an attempt to stay on property lines. Some of the lines at this level stayed pretty close to how they were drawn by stakeholders. He showed these options. The result from this evaluation process was the Refined Universe of Options.

Mr. Rivera indicated that at this point in the study the route options were broken into smaller pieces for evaluation. Wherever there was an intersection, a nodal point was created. Each link was evaluated individually, but also considered for their connecting links. He went through each of the individual lines. He said some options were eliminated in a line because the connections were impacting a constraint and when the lines are all together it is difficult to see that because of the scale used in the drawings for the PowerPoint. There were fourteen different lines at the Refined Universe of Options. The screening included six critical criteria, which were residences, schools, parks, landfills, cemeteries and historic structures. He pointed to one option that was removed because of its impact to a developed subdivision. Homes were not counted at this point. The same process was happening in adjacent Section B. In that section option B6 was eliminated due to impacts to a large residential development. The removal of B6 resulted in the elimination of, A32 in Section A. The two options connected to A32 also went away. Mr. Rivera pointed to historical sites and cemeteries on the map. He pointed out that an option impacted both of those things and also a development so that option was removed. A15 and A18 connected to that link and were also eliminated. Along FM 482 there were quite a few historical structures which also resulted in options being eliminated.

A17 connected A2 to A10 which was eliminated when its connecting link was eliminated. The links connecting to those were also removed although it is possible for those links to have no impacts. They were removed because of impacts in the links to which they are connected. Links A4, A5, A6 and A9 were eliminated due to historical impacts along FM 482. Links A12 and A14 were removed due to impacts to cemeteries. Links A13 and A20 were eliminated because they did not have a connection back to IH 35 because its links were eliminated due to those impacts to cemeteries. Link A23 could not be reconnected to other options to provide a connection to IH-35 and there was no advantage to doing so in light of other options still available, so it was eliminated. Link A31 was eliminated because it was connected to A23. Link A29 was a redundant option to A23, so that remained an option. Links A7 and A8 were also redundant options, so A8 was eliminated and A7 remained. Link A25 was redundant with A21, so A25 was eliminated and A21 remained.

Now the technical team took the resulting options and conducted a technical assessment to reconnect the routes remaining. Link A3 was reconnected to A10, avoiding the historic structure and homes in the area. Sections B and F were also at this phase. Section F had options that required a connection to Section A. Two options were developed in Section A to connect to the options in Section F. Mr. Rivera said that at the scale the exhibits are it is difficult to see some of the minor adjustments that were made. Section A22 connecting to A10 was refined to allow another option. A short link was developed to connect A21 to A11. In Section B, there was an adjustment connecting to Hwy 46, which caused a small adjustment in Section A by moving an option about 200 feet. Link A7 was adjusted to connect to another option. Section A11 was extended to make a connection that would create a continuous alignment. Link A22 was two links and was made one link. The route options at this stage were renumbered and became the Viable Options.

Mr. Rivera indicated that after the second round of public meetings there were adjustments made to the options. In Section A some options were moved to stay on property lines. Section A5 was moved down and was realigned to stay close to the property lines and A4 was moved up to stay close to property lines. At this stage, Section B developed an option labeled B23, close to where A23 had been in the Refined Universe of Options in Section A. To connect to the option in Section B, B23, the team developed option A10 in Section A. The team conducted further technical assessment and then reconnected A2. Sections A5 and A4 were connected to A3 and F14 and F15 were also adjusted at this point. The connection to A18 moved down so that option was reassessed. Two other options were refined and became one option. One option was removed and two links were developed to provide those connections. He said options were changed in response to feedback received at the second round of public meetings. The result was the Refined Viable Options.

Mr. Rivera brought up an exhibit for Section F which showed a development that caused the elimination of options in Section F. The option in Section F that was eliminated also caused the links in Section A to be eliminated. Links A1 and A2 were eliminated because the connection in Section F was removed. A3 was the connecting link to A1 and A2 so that was also eliminated. He said the resulting options were all viable, good options.

At this level the team screened for options based on their connection to IH-35 and the crossing of the Guadalupe River. Section A did not have a river crossing so at this level of screening the team evaluated based on the connection to IH-35. Section A had two options crossing IH-35. He explained that the options that cross IH-35 also cross between two transmission towers. A slight modification of 300 feet was made to go between the two transmission towers. Options were also adjusted to stay close to property lines. He noted that at this stage the adjustments made were slight and cannot be readily seen on the exhibits. In response to feedback concerned about flooding on FM 1863, the options in that area were adjusted to stay outside the floodplain and provide a better connection. At this stage the team had three connections to Hwy 46 and two of them had minimal impacts. One of the options had more impacts to large parcels so the team considered this option the least viable and it was removed. There was now a need to connect back from A10 to A8 so there was a slight adjustment minimizing impacts to properties. The result was the Shortlist of Options.

The Shortlist of Options had three options. These options were evaluated for the section and also for their connection to adjacent sections. The options at this level were screened on the full matrix of criteria which included 31 items. Mr. Rivera showed part of the matrix for Section A options. He pointed out that the study team assigned a color code where the lightest green was the most desirable option and the darker green was the least desirable. A threshold was assigned and the coloration was determined for each option. The part of the matrix showing had all of the options ranked similarly in desirability. At this stage, individual homes were counted. Further down on the matrix there was one option that had more impacts to large parcels. The threshold used to determine the color assigned to each option for each criteria was: impacts to less than or equal to five were deemed light green; between six and nine impacts were deemed green; more than ten impacts were deemed dark green. That was one thing that stood out between the three options at this stage was that Option 2 had impacts to six large parcels and the impacts were deemed more severe, compared to the other two options, since the parcel was split closer to the middle. Other criteria evaluated at this stage included "Conforms to AASHTO Design Criteria." Mr. Rivera stated that each of the options got a light green, meaning "Yes, they would meet this criterion." This means each of the options was deemed equal according to the criteria. However, in selecting between the two options remaining at this stage and also considering connecting to Hwy 46, one of the two remaining options had better terrain intersecting with Hwy 46 than the other option. He showed photos of the area where the two options are located. One option provided an at-grade level crossing which has better engineering and would have less flooding. Based on these things the study team recommended Route 1 as the better option in Section A.

Mr. Rivera showed how the recommended option in Section A compares to the currently adopted New Braunfels Outer Loop. He stated that the recommendation could possibly displace 3 homes and hopefully none since the corridor identified is wide enough to make adjustments in the future. The currently adopted loop displaces 11 homes. The recommendation affects no historic structures; the currently adopted loop affects several. The recommendation affects no cemeteries; the currently adopted loop affects two. The currently

adopted route is better when you consider impacts to wildlife habitats and only affects three 50+ acre parcels, as opposed to the four affected by the recommended route. He stated that the process followed for Section A was also followed for the remaining sections.

Ask clarifying questions about the process in general.

Dr. Levett asked about the matrix slides shown. He said the preferred route took more houses and has more acreage impacted by vegetation/wildlife and less acreage impacted in the 100-year floodplain and archeological areas. He stated that when you compare the recommended route and the B side, it comes down to one displaced home versus a possible environmental justice population and a possible geologic formation. The criteria are weighted and the number one weighted criteria were residential displacements. When you compare the options it seems to come down to criteria ranked 13 and 15 which are the potential populations and geological formations versus residences. He said he could not see that the data was being objectively compared. It would seem that if there was one more house displaced and it was the number one weighted criteria then that should have more weight than the other criteria. Mr. Rivera stated that for planning studies the process typically done is the one outlined in the presentation. He stated that the criteria on the matrix were all evaluated. Dr. Levett stated that looking at Sections A and B it seemed to him that each option was very similar but the weighed criteria should be used to differentiate them. Mr. Rivera stated that you also have to evaluate the options connecting in the adjacent sections. He said that in Section B the highest ranking option that connects to Route 3 in Section A would be Route 13, which ranks 8th overall.

Dr. Levett stated that it was unclear what happened when routes were eliminated then they were brought back. Mr. Rivera explained that to his knowledge there was not a single route that was brought back the same as when it was eliminated. He stated that sometimes the modifications are slight and difficult to see at the scale of the exhibits the Task Force has. Dr. Levett stated that A26 was eliminated and looks very close to the final recommendation. Mr. Rivera stated that the option was not exactly the same, and that you also have to consider that options were eliminated due to impacts from the connections even if there were no impacts in the option itself.

Mr. Schulze asked about historic structures and he stated he was unclear what "historical resources" were. He commented that through the process he was unaware of Section 106 being brought up at any of the meetings. He stated that Section 106 was first mentioned in the Study Report. He pointed out that was when he was able to determine that it was what protected historic properties. He stated the study team had to move the route in on Highway 46 East because the landowners figured out what protections existed for their historic properties. He asked how the team evaluated the property associated with the historic structures. He asked why the team talks about historic resources and structures but does not mention historic properties and they are not identified on the map. Mr. Rivera responded that for the study a historic resource was a registered historical site as well as potentially eligible historical sites. These were identified in the study area using published data. He stated that assessments would need to be made regarding whether the structure is historical and/or the property it is located on is also eligible. Mr. Schulze stated that he felt that was a weak point in the information gathering. He asked why the team did not do educational outreach on this federal guideline. Ms. Krause stated that at a public meeting she gave information to people in attendance so they could take action if they thought they might have a historically eligible site or cemetery. She asked to post this information on the website and was told that Judy Freisenhan said not to post it. She was told she could put the information on the tables to distribute at the meetings.

Ms. Dietz stated she felt the detailed explanation given during the presentation should be provided for the remaining sections. Mr. Rivera stated that it would help if the group could agree that Section A has been presented and there are no questions about the recommendation then it would make the adjacent sections a little easier to go thru since the options in those sections would need to tie into the recommendation in Section A. He stated that Section B has a lot of options. Mrs. Dietz stated that the public needs to see the presentation for each section. Ms. Blaschke stated that Section A did not have a river crossing or other constraints found in the other sections and the presentation should be done for each section. Mr. Rivera stated that the Task Force had been presented with a DVD with all of the information. Mrs. Dietz stated that the public had a difficult time processing the information from the reports.

Mr. Ross stated that the presentation that evening gave him confidence that TxDOT did things for a reason. He asked how decisions in the sections were made when they affected each other. Mr. Rivera replied that there were several teams working on the different sections and they met on a regular basis. When they would meet the team would discuss options for connecting the sections and those decisions were reached collaboratively between the teams working on the sections throughout the process.

Dean Word commented about the information that was presented on the DVD given to the Task Force members. He asked how the team weighted the options once they were evaluated down to the final three options. He said the information is available without having to have written responses given on handouts a week before the meeting. Dr. Levett stated that he agreed there was a lot of information but that the analysis given during the meeting was not specifically outlined in the reports. Mr. Rivera agreed that was a good point because the reports developed by the study were developed for a technical audience. He added that as he prepared the presentation for this meeting he went through the reports and there is a lot of information there.

Dr. Levett agreed that the presentation should be done for the B Section as well. Mr. Rivera stated that he thought the Section A presentation could be deemed representative of the screening process for each of the sections.

Dr. Sacco asked if it would be possible to go through each of the sections and have people ask clarifying questions on the sections they are concerned about instead of going thru the process for each individual option. Ms. Ximenes pointed out that her intent in developing the agenda as it was presented was to give people an opportunity to ask questions on the remaining sections, prioritizing those questions and addressing them in the upcoming December meeting.

Mr. Smith stated that the presentation did a good job of walking through the decision making process. He stated he did not have questions about why the recommendation was made but he wanted to point out that at the last phase in screening, when there were the final three options, people should be aware of how close the options are and what a "knife edge" decision it was that selected one over the other. He stated that some options were refined to miss constraints and some options were just removed. Some options that went away could have been salvaged with minor refinements. Ms. Ximenes also stated that it was important to keep in mind that this was a planning level study.

Identify questions on Segments C, D, E and F. Prioritize them.

Ms. Ximenes asked the Task Force to take a few moments to write down any questions they had on Sections C, D, E and F on their evaluation form. Ms. Ximenes asked the Task Force to submit any additional questions by December 7th.

Review and discuss the two or three questions that were prioritized from the ones answered in writing already.

Ms. Ximenes asked if there was a need to talk about any of the written questions from Sections A and B. She asked the group to pick three of the questions from those responded to in writing to discuss.

At that point Jonathan Bean, Transportation Planning Director for TxDOT came before the group and thanked the Task Force members for their participation. He stated that the one thing TxDOT did not want to do was make the Task Force feel that they were being railroaded into completing its charge in a hurry, but there are budgetary constraints that need to be considered if the timeline is to be extended. He acknowledged that Task Force members were aware of that and the intention is not to conclude the work too early, but at the same time he was aware of the original commitment Task Force members made. He emphasized the importance of getting the information to the Task Force members clearly and that needed to be balanced with the original time commitment Task Force members made. He stated he would have Ms. Ximenes work with the Task Force to get consensus on their commitment for how to proceed. If a slight change in the timeline was needed in order to continue for a few more months and allow the Task Force to review the screening process for each section he was okay with that.

Mr. Rivera suggested starting with the Viable Options for each section, instead of the Universe of Options would make the presentations on the other sections shorter.

Rusty Brockman stated he was pleased with the presentation for Section A, but there are five sections left. If two sections could be presented at the December meeting the rest could be done in subsequent meetings and the Task Force could be done by February. That would be one more meeting than what was originally scheduled. Ms. Ximenes pointed out that the January workday had already been added to the original schedule. Mr. Brockman noted that he was unaware that the January meeting was an all day meeting. He suggested the presentations were more than worthwhile, and also addressing the Section 106 comments was important. He said it was worth the time committed to go through each of the sections if the offer is there and TxDOT is willing to support that.

Mr. Bean stated it would be important to have a target date, produce a schedule and stick to it so TxDOT could have an idea of how much further the review process would continue. Ms. Ximenes stated the meetings were typically scheduled for the third Monday of the month. In March that could fall during Spring Break. Bennie Bock asked if there was a way to have two meetings in one month and Ms. Ximenes responded that the problem was scheduling since there was only one day, the third Monday of the month, that most people on the Task Force were available.

Mr. Ross asked how soon the team could present the information on the other sections similar to what was done that evening for Section A. Mr. Bean stated that preparation time was a consideration in scheduling and Mr. Rivera added that it would depend on how much detail was put into the presentations. He stated two weeks would probably not be enough time. Ms. Ximenes asked if two sections, B and C, could be done at the next meeting and the rest in January. The meetings would also have to be three hour meetings.

Ms. Ximenes stated that one of the advantages the team had in preparing for the presentation today was having the questions from the Task Force and public ahead of time.

She summarized the working plan for proceeding with the meetings.

- There would be a 30-minute presentation on Sections B, C, D, E and F with clarifying questions after each section, so it should be assumed that at least 45 minutes to an hour should be allowed for each section. That would be about 1 hour per section.
- The December meeting is already scheduled for December 21 and is scheduled to be three hours.
- The third Monday in January falls on Martin Luther King Day. The Task Force decided not to meet on that day. Ms. Ximenes suggested scheduling the January meeting for the fourth Monday in January, which falls on January 25th.
- The February meeting would be third Monday, February 15, which is President's Day. Although some people would have a holiday that day, the Task Force agreed to hold the meeting on that day.
- There would be about two and a half hours at each meeting to go through the sections. Those next three meetings should be sufficient time to review each section and the Task Force could also begin to work on recommendations at the February meeting.
- Each meeting would be three hours.
- There would be a meeting scheduled in March to finish any work that needs to be completed for the recommendations. The March meeting would still be a full-day Saturday workday and only use the time needed and conclude early if the full time is not used. **There was consensus on this new schedule.**

Mr. Rivera asked if the December meeting would present B and F to divide the preparation for the presentations between his team and the KCI (Kevin Kennedy) team.

Dr. Sacco asked if there was a way to move the public comment period so that it was after the presentations were made. Ms. Ximenes said efforts would be made to go through the beginning part of the agenda more quickly.

Dr. Levett asked if it was possible to ask questions on the “Sequence of Events” handout. Ms. Ximenes indicated that was fine.

Dr. Levett asked if there were 15 minutes of public comment time. He proposed that since the meeting time was extended if the public comments could all be moved to the beginning. Ms. Ximenes stated the public comment period at the end of the meeting could be kept at 8:00 and have the Task Force continue for the remaining hour. There had been considerable discussion at previous meetings about the timing of the public comments and she wanted to respect the decisions made previously by the Task Force.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the presentations would begin with the Shortlist of Options. Dr. Levett asked if it could start at the Viable Options. Mr. Rivera asked if the same level of graphics and animations would be expected for the remaining sections and the response was to keep that level of animation and graphics for the remaining sections. Dr. Levett suggested starting with the Viable Options. Mr. Rivera asked if all sections would start with the Viable. Mrs. Blaschke stated that yes, the sections should all be treated the same. The consultants agreed to begin with the Viable Options for the presentations.

Respond to priority questions from the other segments, if further research is not necessary.

This part of the agenda was not completed due to the meeting schedule being modified to include presentations on all sections.

Agenda Item IX: Comments from the public

Stacy Graupner

[From Stacy Graupner] “While I know that every single one of you are just as tired as we are, I thank you for the job you are doing. I wish I could bring cupcakes to you every week. I thank you because you are tired. But what I am asking you is you are that of a jury at a trial. It is your responsibility and your job to dissect however many of these books these are, and to ask the questions. And thank you for getting my Section B and Section C, but please don’t be held to the two minutes that I get because that is all we get, is two to three minutes. But you get the time to represent me and that is all I ask that you do. I beg of you as a passionate resident here in New Braunfels to do that; to make sure, because no matter what I want, at the end of all of this, whether it is three months, or three years, or thirty years, is to go home with a clear conscience. That you did what you could have to preserve, to protect and to do what is best for New Braunfels. Tired as you are, you were chosen. You volunteered and we thank you, but the public is not heard. We are not. I can tell you the comments that people say. They sit there and they say, “Are you for real?” “Are you kidding?” No. So it is your responsibly and I can’t say it enough, but thank you and please stick to whatever it is to get that job done.

Marty Godfrey

[From Marty Godfrey] “My name is Marty Godfrey and I am a member of the Guadalupe River Road Alliance. It is a new group that has just come up from the grassroots. We are residents. We are business people, regular visitors to the area and sportsmen. In short, we are opposed to any roadway that crosses the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone and the Guadalupe River. We feel that it is environmentally and economically impractical. TxDOT, on our disk [the DVD with the Study Report and appendices] has listed Section B as “potential sensitive geological area.” Just four words on an area that has been designated by the State of Texas, by the Edwards Aquifer Authority, by WORD and by the National Park Association and National Park Service as already environmentally sensitive and special. We in the Alliance suggest that all of the decision makers who are involved in this decision which has a terrific impact on Comal County go out to Second Crossing, get out of your car, look over at the bluffs on the west side of the river and then picture a multi-lane highway going across with Kenworth trucks, noise and the pollution. We have contacted Dr. Sterling Robertson. He’s with the TxDOT Environmental Affairs office and we asked about a proper environmental study that would cover basically Section B. His response to us was that it might take five to ten years to do a proper environmental study that would meet federal regulations; and I don’t know what that would cost but I do know who is going to pay for it. It’s going to be us. So our suggestion is keep the roads we got.”

Gene Saunders

[From Gene Saunders] "I'm here tonight to represent the Homeowners Association from Mission Hills Ranch. The board has drafted this letter and I need to read it into the minutes so that it could be part of the record.

'Homeowners residing in the Mission Hills community have been following the progress of the proposed New Braunfels Outer Loop and wish to express some serious concern. We are currently a community of 325 homes. The total plan build out is 387. We have gated and non-gated sections in our community and one of the strongest appeals of our community is the natural setting situated in the hill county. Our community has extensive common areas that have been left in a natural state. These natural setting and other attributes have been the main reason for other homeowners to buy in our community and live in New Braunfels. The proposed outer loop will cross the 46 just three a few yards from the entrance to our community. The design of a three tier overpass, six lane, service roads and all that come with it will be a detriment to our property and the property value. It is not the place that we want to bring up our children. The study was originally done years ago and has been updated from time to time but appears as though the spurt of growth in the recent years has not been adequately captured in the study. Specific areas of concern in addition to overall impact of our property are that TxDOT made minimal effort to notify us when plans were changed; the noise level that will occur because of this new road right next door to our community; business growth along a currently undeveloped natural area. How were all of these decisions made? When were we notified that the loop path had changed? When was the last change made? What was the logic behind the change? Has impact to the fragile hill county environment, or the water supply or the aquifer or the springs ever been evaluated?'

Ms. Ximenes stated that the remaining comments were submitted in writing earlier for the record and would be included with the meeting information. [A full copy of the letter being read is included in the attachments along with these minutes]

Diane Scharnhorst

[From Diane Scharnhorst] "I'm here to talk about Section B. On the map of the second public meetings they said that they developed B23 at the subsequent MAPO meeting with our Lone Oak Subdivision neighbors. At that point when we first started I was on B6 and they were B23. B6 was listed in the handouts that you received last week as not being nonviable. That connects directly to the Mission Hills that he was talking about before. The A26, 27, 28, 29 whatever; all those that were dropped off. That is what my concern is about. What was viable? When was it viable? When did it get changed? And I noticed that from the Task Force meetings that there were some questions about that also. Section 5 with your color coded map you'll see that in our neighborhood they have Hill Haven listed twice. It is only one street. This map is wrong. How can you make decisions about where the route goes when you can't even keep up with the streets? Over and over again I was told I wasn't viable but I guess I really was when it became recommended. I want a logical progression not just so that it connects to A or connect to the River. But why was viable sections put back in when we were told we weren't viable. Just because they had a small meeting. We didn't go. We thought we were safe. I would have gone to the October meetings but based on what was in the paper and what I was told by Cale Vela over and over again my property was safe. Maybe we should have yelled more."

Nancy Krueger

[From Nancy Krueger] "Good evening. I know I have been here every meeting so I know how tired you all are and so I want to tell you thank you for your time, I really appreciate it. I did have a question and I noticed this on the questions that were posed. I don't know, did we ever get an answer about the rules and regs from Guadalupe County development are? Did that ever get an answered? One of you Task Force people need to ask that that gets answered at the next meeting. I wish also that we, the voters of

Guadalupe and Comal Counties, could vote on whether this Outer Loop was really needed and necessary and if it would really benefit the citizens of this area. Thank you.”

Agenda Item X: Adjourn

Ms. Ximenes thanked all of those in attendance for their flexibility in staying with the process. She asked those in attendance to please fill out their comment cards and evaluation forms including their questions or thoughts and put them in the comment card box.