

**New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force
Meeting #9 (December 21, 2009): Meeting Evaluation Forms Tally**



	Agree	Disagree	No Comment
A total of 15 Meeting Evaluation Forms were received.			
1. The objectives for this meeting were clearly articulated.	14		1
2. The stated objectives for this meeting were met.	11	1	3
3. I felt that my time was valued and utilized well.	8	3	4
4. The handouts/presentations were appropriate and helpful.	10	1	4
5. The information from speakers/presenters was clear and informative.	12	1	2
6. The facilitator was well prepared and fair to all viewpoints.	9	2	4
7. The facilitator was helpful in framing the issues and process of the meeting.	8	1	6
8. I believe the topics were covered adequately in the time available.	10	2	3
9. There was sufficient time for public comment.	8	5	2
10. Task Force communications (i.e., materials, calls, logistics and other information) are being handled effectively.	11	1	3
11. The meetings are convenient and conducive to our work (i.e., meeting time, meeting length, location, audio visual, acoustics, overall meeting space).	10	3	2
12. The overall process that the Task Force is using is effective in bringing diverse views together to come up with recommendations for inclusion into the Draft Study Report.	9	1	5

Comments regarding questions (above):

Evaluation Form 1:

Question 4: new “option” made – Somewhat Agree/Disagree. “Would have liked a copy of each section that I believe we got with A. Some of us do not have color printers.”

Question 9: “Would like to see more time allotted.”

Evaluation Form 2:

Question 11: “This was a Horrible date to hold this particular meeting. Otherwise other dates are fine.”

Evaluation Form 3:

Question 6: “somewhat” added in to the question after the word “and”.

Evaluation Form 4:

Question 11: “Too cold temperature wise.”

Evaluation Form 5:

Question 3: “Not due to presenters but because of redundant hidden agenda questions.”

Evaluation Form 6:

Question 3: “Needed maps for section F”

Comments:

- Rudy and Mr. Kennady did great jobs on their presentation. However it would be good to have a copy of the refined viable options with the final route added for each section (B-F). Trying to see

or read Mr. Kennady's map was really hard. Having a copy in front of you would have been very helpful. I would really like to see us receive copies of these maps for section C and D at the next meeting. I would also like to commend Mr. Kennady with going the extra mile to note the farmstead found after the study was done and work with the owners to try and avoid the property. I would also like to see that if we have any extra time at the end of the January meeting – we would allow that extra time for "Comments from the Public."

- I believe the reason for the growing hostility is the fact that there is strong belief from members of the task force and members of the audience there has been no strong reasons and facts as to why the outer loop is needed at all. It would be extremely beneficial for RJ Rivera Associates, Inc. and/or TxDOT to again state as to the need of the outer loop. (Make sure facts are provided) Also there needs to be someone representing both counties to speak to some of the issues raised that Rivera or other facilitators cannot answer.
- Would like to see printed maps regardless of cost. These are effective tools that we cannot utilize otherwise. The meetings are far more informative than in the past. Please be patient with our citizens who are so concerned with this proposed project.
- 1) I hereby request your mailing list of impacted and/or potentially impacted landowners, section by section.

2) Seems like the consultants are somewhat shifting the responsibility of planning and designing the loop. Guadalupe counties thoroughfare should be explained with supporting information. How are the officials of various political entities invited to task force meetings? I hope the task force members who have a vested interest in section A will support with their attendance, participation in discussion of all other sections. To Dean Word. I have not yet been convinced that this loop has been planned effectively, and I hereby give notice that at this time I am not in favor of the loop. The information concerning the September meeting is not available on website. No agenda, no comments, no minutes, no evaluation, etc.
- Please stay on topic so we can cover the topics adequately. Whether or not materials were posted on the website in a timely fashion is a mute point. The main point is that the public has access to the materials now. Again, this task force is not charged with approving the loop plan nor charged with deciding "no build" as a decision. The charge was to review the process. When the loop is built, it will be on someone's property or in someone's backyard. Let's make sure the best location is chosen. Both engineers did a good job with their presentations. Thank you.
- Provide maps of areas for task force so those not having manual of final report or they forgot theirs to refer to during talks to be able to refer to before meeting.
- 1) In Rudy's discussion of options in section B he said that the potential alignment following the electrical transmission lines was thrown out. It would seem that the transmission line and the proposed roadway would both be undesirable additions to property. Wouldn't it make sense that these 2 items be co-located as much as possible to reduce undesirable impacts to the local community. Please provide further discussion why this was not deemed to be a suitable alignment for the proposed road.

2) Rudy mentioned that River Road is identified arterial route in the New Braunfels Thoroughfare Plan. My recollection of this plan did not identify River Road as suggested. Please provide more information as to the source of this plan (date, title, etc.).

3) In discussions of the possible routes in section B at the potential intersections with FM 306 there was one house identified that was apparently not accurately located. RJ Rivera's assistant

(Yobana?) indicated that aerial photos available today are more accurate than those used in the original study. This brings to question the accuracy of the data used for the study. What are the potential impacts to the validity of the study? It seems that an evaluation of the potential impact of data errors is in order to be certain that the study decisions are accurate, defensible, and supported by the best available data.

4) Were residents of New Braunfels, Comal and Guadalupe Counties given an opportunity to vote on adoption of the Outer Loop Study or the New Braunfels Thoroughfare Plan. Essentially, have the residents been provided an opportunity to approve the need for this road?

5) Comal County is about to put in place a Regional Habitat Conservation Plan which allows for "incidental takes" without the need for EIS studies on these projects. Can this Habitat Conservation Plan be used to address EIS requirements. Should the road be built with private funding?

- Linda, I am not getting information in mail ahead of time. Make sure 100 year flood area shown on all sections. Are the current slides reflecting the 100 year flood area? Please mark future presentations with crossroads. Please mark ETJ on next sections. Place more pictures of area into slides to help folks get a better idea about the area.
- Members should refrain from asking the same question to same time. Please turn in your comments or question for the next meeting until answer is to your satisfaction instead.
- Perhaps the consultants could identify (up front) the things originally missed, but now known.
- Kevin, nice job. Flexibility to fine tune in future phase a good point.
- Mr. Rivera didn't explain why property lines seem far less important as reflected in his decisions. No adequate explanation as to why an engineering study cannot say "not a good place for an exchange or roadway." Let's see documentation that New Braunfels city and Comal County have denied permits, altered plats, etc. on "basis" of earlier loop designation.