

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| Date | Last Name | First Name | Comment | Response |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|---|--|
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Pollard | Karen | More detailed information and photos of residential areas adjacent to the proposed routes particularly when the ROW is close to boundary lines. | Concerns will be addressed in the on-going evaluation of alternatives; more data will be requested from local agencies to evaluate the reasonable alternatives in more details. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Simnacher | Larry | Access if road goes through our property | Access details for specific properties will be addressed later in the study once a recommended alternative is selected. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | S | Carl | At 71 years old, I have watched all these projects. Yes, I see that route should be between Dayton & Huffman at curve on 1960 & RR. Route need to use land that is less populated and conserve relocating people to serve the community best. | Every effort will be made to minimize impacts to the community. There are several alternatives shown as described in the comment. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Bumstead | Richard | I think it will help develop the Liberty County. B-4, B-6, B-7, B-8 have too much impact on existing residences. | Comment noted. These impacts will be considered in the evaluation of Preliminary Alternatives. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Anonymous | | B-3 should be moved west to go along property lines. | Comment noted. Please note that not all alternatives will be carried forward as Reasonable Alternatives and only one will be recommended. The alternatives will be refined during each step in the process and property lines will be one of the considerations taken into account as alternatives are further refined. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Robertson | David | I can see a benefit for hurricane evacuation. Otherwise, I don't feel that this section is needed. Congestion is not problematic in this area. I suspect that future use will not support the cost. | Comment noted. Please review the need and purpose document that addresses your specific concerns, the document is posted on: www.grandpky.com . The proposed facility would also address the regional roadway network and would help to alleviate congestion in the region. Initial traffic analysis indicates that existing facilities are not adequate to handle future population growth demands. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|----------|---|--|
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Kinison | Geoffrey | It should facilitate hurricane evacuations from the south and general area traffic flow now restricted to FM 1960. I would avoid the area in Mont Belvieu that is west of Texas Hwy 146 that is already petrochemical. Leave some distance between the plants and the highway so plant emergencies will have less impact on road usage. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of preliminary alternatives. Alternatives C1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 are all east of SH 146 away from petrochemical plants as recommended in your comment. Alternatives C4 and C7 west of the plant are at a good distance away from existing plants. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Price | Dee | Please avoid Lake Houston Park. I support any alternative that minimizes environmental impact. My community is concerned about the potential impact that this construction would have on water flow and flooding in this general area. | The study will include alternatives that avoid ROW impacts to Lake Houston Park. The new facility will be designed so it does not adversely affect current drainage conditions. Any additional drainage resulting from the new facility will be mitigated. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process includes evaluation of alternatives and minimization of negative impacts. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Bumstead | Sylvia | Our property may be affected by the route of the highway. Increase property values. Lessen congestion on local roadways. Have a Question & Answer period. | Comment noted. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | May | Lisa | Great way to reroute congestion & increase value of property in Harris County. | Comment noted. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | May | Buddy | Great way to reroute congested area. | Comment noted. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Martinez Jr. | Tony | Just curious -- where on East Community Drive will project go behind or front of my house? | Display maps at public meeting showed approximate locations of all the preliminary alignment alternatives. The maps are available at www.grandpky.com under Segments H and I-1. A detailed map of the recommended alignment will be available after the publication of the DEIS. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------|---|--|
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Sarman | Stanley | Yes, the Grand Parkway & Segment H& I-1 are intended for evacuation routes, better mobility. Effort so far is very complete and informative. A4 - connect to Segment G. C3 - connect to I-2. I strongly feel Segment H must connect to Segment G at the same location on US 59. Segment I-1 needs to connect to Segment I-2 at IH10. Offset connections are confusing and difficult to negotiate for the general public. No, keep up the work and let's go on with the project for the benefit of the community as a whole. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the ongoing evaluation of alternatives, the impacts of an offset connection, as well as, connections to other segments will be addressed as part of the evaluation to compare the various alternatives. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Leder | Frank | The long delays in the completion of this project poses a significant burden on landowners who have their property for sale when their land is on the tentative alignment of the GP, as mine is. This project has cast a marketing shadow on my land since 1985. | The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is the first step in identifying a preferred route and minimizing speculation through the development of an environmental impact statement (EIS). A public hearing is anticipated to be held to receive public input on the recommended alignment in the 2nd quarter of 2008. The route identified by the approved Final EIS will be the final alignment proposed for construction. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Brennan III | Johnny | A4 seems the best to me. Has less impact on homeowners. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of preliminary alternatives. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Birthisel | Robin | Believe this is ridiculous size. Break B1 site off to join B2 near Plum Grove. What are options for homeowners when site is picked? Need a Q&A for all aside from today group Q&A. Will bring up questions some may not think of. | Comment noted. A public hearing is scheduled to be held to receive public input on the recommended alignment in the 2nd quarter of 2008. The route identified by the approved Final EIS will be the final alignment proposed for construction. Address ROW acquisition question. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Pennington | Frances | Worried about more flooding in Caney and Peach Creek. These creeks already prone to flooding. | The new facility will be designed so it does not adversely affect current drainage conditions. All efforts to avoid and minimize impacts to floodplains will be made throughout project development. Any additional drainage resulting from the new facility will be mitigated. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|----------|--|--|
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Pollard | Randy | Would like to see copies of aerial maps provided for citizens to take home. | Aerial maps available for download at the Grand Parkway website www.grandpky.com . |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | Gagliano | Jackie | Areas flood and we don't want road construction causing more flooding. The creeks already flood and roads are likely to flood so much more. Digging & dredging will make it worse. | The new facility will be designed so it does not adversely affect current drainage conditions. . All efforts to avoid and minimize impacts to floodplains will be made throughout project development. Any additional drainage resulting from the new facility will be mitigated. |
| 05-08-07 PSM 2 | White | Kimberly | Would like proposed line to shift more east. B1 appears to have the least impact on residential and commercial property. B1 tying into B2 appears to be the best way to go. Need FAQ's!!! Landowner/homeowner impact? Eminent domain? | Cannot determine which lines are in question from the comment. B1 and B2 are two different alternatives within the same section – cannot determine the recommended alignment envisioned by commenter; therefore, unable to respond. A FAQ sheet will be provided at future meetings. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Howard | W.F. | C6 adjoins my property for several 100 feet. Would donate land to project. A north/south road with service roads is needed between 565 and I-10. I like the plan. Will be great for East Harris & Chambers County. A road from 565 to I-10 is much needed, but it must have feeder roads so that the citizens can get on and off. Need to value options to let us know which are most likely. I would donate land to project to help locate an option. | All reasonable alternatives will be evaluated to same level of details and the study will recommend an optimum alternative in terms of value and benefits. Access roads will be evaluated for the recommended alternative. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Howard | Jack | Should support and encourage commercial development. Very little benefit to this area without feeder roads. C6 seems the most likely route. Feeder roads would be beneficial to this area. I would donate land if feeder roads area built. Without feeder roads, there is little or no benefit except to the traveling public. | Comment noted, currently the facility is designed not to have continuous frontage roads. Feeder roads will be provided if necessary to maintain current access and / or if the toll facility uses the same alignment as an existing non-toll facility. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Anonymous | | My sister lives on Needlepoint Drive. I am concerned about possibly having to pay a toll to enter Needlepoint Drive. I am also concerned about having to detour to I-10 to enter Needlepoint. I am not able to enter Needlepoint via FM 565. | Needlepoint Drive is located on the south side of I-10 and connects to Grand Parkway Segment I-2, which is outside of the Segment H and I-1 study area. Please contact the Texas Department of Transportation, Beaumont District for issues related to Segment I-2. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|----------------|---|---|
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Anon | | Is Fisher Road going to become a toll road? | Fisher Road is outside this project's study area. Please contact the Texas Department of Transportation, Beaumont District for information regarding the construction of Segment I-2. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | McKey | Wayne | Controlled access is necessary. | Comment noted – proposed facility is a controlled access facility. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Purvis | James | B7 & B8 will go through my land. B7 & B8 would cut through many housing developments. There has to be a route that would not affect so many people and cause the disruption to their lives. | Comment noted. There are several other alternatives in section B. As shown at the second Public Scoping Meeting, alternatives B7 and B8 complement historic routes and follow existing facilities." Impacts associated with these routes will be evaluated and considered in the on-going analysis of alternatives. Every attempt will be made to avoid and minimize impacts. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Stripling | Clifton | It will be very nice to travel from I-10 to Hwy 59 without traveling the Beltway. The beltway is slower than I-610. Please join this segment with the I-2 segment at I-10. DO NOT put more traffic onto I-10 between the C-6 and C-1 areas. | Comment noted. Traffic impacts to either IH 10 or US 59 which would result from the offset connections will be evaluated for the reasonable alternatives. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Loocke | June T. Wright | Avoid expensive homes, ranches which are beginning to be built in our area. Probably needs to be between Crosby & Dayton near 1960 area. A lot of empty land. A lot of traffic. Yes, progress. Crosby is beginning to attract larger businesses & restaurants. It would be great not to have to go to Baytown or Humble for entertainment, etc. So far, it's good. Helpful people. Good maps. This is our first public meeting. Learned a lot of information. Because Huffman, Crosby & Dayton are being more "citified", businesses are coming into this area. We need to decongest in traffic Crosby, FM 2100 had recorded 70,000 cars everyday according to the Starbuck's survey and was in the Community News. We need other alternatives to get to Houston or avoid Houston traffic congestion if we want to go to San Antonio, etc. It is something I was waiting for 20 odd years. Just keep on doing what you are doing. Keep us informed on the progress. | Comment noted. Concerns regarding traffic and congestion on existing facilities will be evaluated for the reasonable alternatives. Impacts to development will also be evaluated in more detail. Every effort will be taken to avoid or minimize adverse impacts to existing development. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Lindon | David | C4 & C7 no opinion. Dislike alternative. Will increase traffic at I-10 & Hwy 146 intersection. Too congestive now; cannot accommodate more traffic. Like C2 alternative. Direct connection with I-2 segment. Takes traffic around Mont Belvieu, but does not eliminate Hwy 146 for Hazmat route. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of preliminary alternatives. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|---------|--|--|
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Sobala | Diana | I am interested in the transportation system in this area. It has been proven during the hurricane Rita that our evacuation system and communication system in times of disaster or danger is inexcusable. When people take the time to personally examine an area before they make rules or vote on something, a lot of money and mistakes could be avoided. I don't think anyone should have the authority to place a vote on something they have not personally. I don't think you should consider C1, C2, C3, C6, C5 because of the inability to use in case there should be an explosion or any other disaster. C4 or C7 are straighter routes and could help evacuate the area in case of a disaster. Also, this parkway should go through an area that is already too congested to accommodate the present traffic. Keeping in mind that everything will be impacted on either side of the corridor. Special interest parties or landowners should not be accommodated. More information on what facilities are lying in the path of the intended proposal. | Comment noted. The facility will serve a regional need for hurricane or other emergency evacuation. Explosions and other disasters may be more localized and would also be considered. The proposed facility will serve emergency vehicles and personnel to respond in more timely fashion during such localized events. The overall evaluation will follow the NEPA process to ensure adverse impacts are avoided or minimized. More information will be collected to properly evaluate the impacts of the reasonable alternatives. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Orr | Bill | I live off 146 S & we hope the new road will make less traffic on 146. | Comment noted. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Anon | | Very needed. Move on as soon as possible. Build it. | Comment noted. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Davis | Jim | I like C5 & C6. | Comment noted. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Winn | Jerry | The people are very helpful. | Comment noted. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Montalvo | Adriana | I am directly affected by Segment I-2. I believe this is a great project. My concern is the in and out traffic of Needlepoint Road. At this time, I am currently making a huge detour to enter my street. It adds about 10 miles to my travel each day to enter my road. The meeting was great and the people were very helpful. | Comment noted. With regard to Needlepoint Drive, connectivity to Grand Parkway Segment I-2, is outside of the Segment H and I-1 study area. Please contact the Texas Department of Transportation, Beaumont District for issues related to Segment I-2. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|---|
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Riceland Interests Ltd. | | Mont \Belvieu area needs exits on and off the Grand Parkway. Let us see exit and entrance ramp proposals and explanations. | Comment noted. Access in the Mont Belvieu area will be addressed during development and evaluation of the Reasonable Alternatives. Access to specific parcels will be evaluated during refinement of the recommended alternative. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Beues Family Ltd. | | There is a great need for exits and on/off the Grand Parkway in Mont Belvieu. Need to see exit/on-ramp proposals w/explanations. | Comment noted. Access in the Mont Belvieu area will be addressed during development and evaluation of the Reasonable Alternatives. Access to specific parcels will be evaluated during refinement of the recommended alternative. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Bode | Daniel | I and my family live on my grandparent's old farm and it has been in our family since 1942. We don't want to see our rural community and the country place and quiet ruined. Finish Beltway 8 first and then work on Grand Parkway. I'm concerned about the loss of the rural way of life along with all the noise and development this project will bring to our area. | The project is proposed as a toll road facility with limited access. Frontage roads will not be built unless needed to maintain existing access on local roads impacted by the toll road, therefore, limiting the amount of potential development. The environmental analysis process will help identify a route that avoids or minimizes adverse impacts and will consider mitigation when needed. A detailed noise analysis will be performed on the recommended alternative and any noise impacts will be analyzed for potential options for noise mitigation. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|--------------|--|--|
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Foote | Bob | East Harris and Liberty Counties are in desperate need for mobility, evacuation, commerce and development. Good work. Best and quickest routing should be used. The county road I live on (Plum Grove Road) was completely clogged for 3 days during Rita. We need help now. | Comment noted. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Voytek | Kenneth | Coordinate with Bayport, Cleveland Corridor, so that they outcome will benefit both objectives (transportation). The consultants at this meeting did not know of the Bayport-Cleveland Corridor. | The Bayport – Cleveland group is included on the mailing list and some members have attended both public meetings. The Study Team is aware of the group's goals and objectives and we have communicated with members of the coalition several times during the study. There will be additional opportunity for the public to provide input. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Clawson | Chiper | C4 & C7 going to IH 10 does not make sense. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of preliminary alternatives. C4 and C7 are only two among a group of seven alternatives being considered within that section. This group of alternatives will be evaluated to identify an alternative that will best meet Need and Purpose for the project and avoid or minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible. |
| 05-09-07 PSM 2 | Fox | William | Because of prospective commercial development in West Liberty County, we are hoping the Parkway will follow near the Cedar Bayou area. | Comment noted. The analysis will consider connectivity to commercial development in the evaluation of the alternatives. |
| 05-14-07 Mail | Sullivan | Margaret Ann | Great idea! It could have been done 10 years ago and there would have been fewer residences in Section B. Avoid flood area near the B4 label on the map. Many residences between 1960 and Highway 90 in eastern Section B. Best alternative is a diversion of B5 joining with C5. The areas marked with red are very low and 4.5" of rain puts water over the grass. The area around my red box at B4 stands in water all winter. Construction would be difficult. The circular red area is a dip in the county road 603 at the intersection of a drainage ditch. With 4" of rain the ditch overflows covering the road for a width of at least 100' up and down the road. The purple area has too many homes too close to the pathway of the proposed road sites. | Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of preliminary and reasonable alternatives. The new facility will be designed so it does not adversely affect current drainage conditions. Culverts or bridges will be used when crossing existing water features, including bayous and creeks. Any additional drainage resulting from the new facility will be mitigated and all efforts to avoid and minimize impacts will be made. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--------|----------|---|---|
| 05-18-07 Mail | Marek | Frank | Needed in light of population projections. This area floods. If built on B-2, what happens to water flow of east branch of Cedar Bayou which runs from east to west? Also, it appears to run directly through our house. Don't really want to move. | The new facility will be designed so it does not adversely affect current drainage conditions. Culverts or bridges will be used when crossing existing water features, including bayous and creeks. Any additional drainage resulting from the new facility will be mitigated and all efforts to avoid and minimize impacts will be made. |
| 05-15-07 Mail | Dixon | Nick | Mayor of City of Mont Belvieu sent a letter stating the City prefers C6 because it hugs existing CWA canal which already separates residential and industrial sides of city, minimizes impact on Cherry Point Subd at SH 146, and an alignment west of CWA canal allows the canal to serve as a natural buffer between roadway and residential areas developing to the east. As C6 leaves the City, do not take position on whether it continues NW or tracks back north. The City strongly objects to C1, C2 & C3 because route isolates land between pkwy and CWA canal to the west, requires acquisition of homes in Cherry Point and brings pkwy closer to new residential developments on our east side. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of the preliminary alternatives. A written response will be forwarded to the Mayor. |
| 05-24-07 Email | Good | Christie | Either B3 or B4 would provide the highest and best use as the other alternatives are either too close in proximity to existing major thoroughfares or too far beyond the reasonable scope of development for the foreseeable future. | Comment noted. The study will evaluate all the alternatives presented at the public meeting and determine which of those alternatives best meet the need and purpose and the evaluation criteria. Cost and benefit analysis will be considered as part of the evaluation. |
| 05-24-07 Email | Voinis | Greg | I prefer segments B3 or B4. | Comment noted. The study will evaluate all the alternatives presented at the public meeting and determine which of those alternatives best meet the need and purpose and the evaluation criteria. Cost and benefit analysis will be considered as part of the evaluation. |
| 05-24-07 Email | Partin | Jeff | I have reviewed the proposed alignments for the Grand Parkway under Segment H, Section B and feel that either alignment B3 or B4 would provide the highest and best use as the other alternatives are either too close in proximity to existing major thoroughfares or too far beyond the reasonable scope of development for the foreseeable future. | Comment noted. The study will evaluate all the alternatives presented at the public meeting and determine which of those alternatives best meet the need and purpose and the evaluation criteria. Cost and benefit analysis will be considered as part of the evaluation. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|---------|--|---|
| 05-24-07 Email | Appel | Kellene | I have reviewed the proposed alignments for the Grand Parkway under Segment H, Section B and feel that either alignment B3 or B4 would provide the highest and best use as the other alternatives are either too close in proximity to existing major thoroughfares or too far beyond the reasonable scope of development for the foreseeable future. | Comment noted. The study will evaluate all the alternatives presented at the public meeting and determine which of those alternatives best meet the need and purpose and the evaluation criteria. Cost and benefit analysis will be considered as part of the evaluation. |
| 05-24-07 Email | Appel | Joel | I have reviewed the proposed alignments for the Grand Parkway under Segment H, Section B and feel that either alignment B3 or B4 would provide the highest and best use as the other alternatives are either too close in proximity to existing major thoroughfares or too far beyond the reasonable scope of development for the foreseeable future. | Comment noted. The study will evaluate all the alternatives presented at the public meeting and determine which of those alternatives best meet the need and purpose and the evaluation criteria. Cost and benefit analysis will be considered as part of the evaluation. |
| 05-24-07 Email | Villarreal | Adriana | I have reviewed the proposed alignments for the Grand Parkway under Segment H, Section B and feel that either alignment B3 or B4 would provide the highest and best use as the other alternatives are either too close in proximity to existing major thoroughfares or too far beyond the reasonable scope of development for the foreseeable future. | Comment noted. The study will evaluate all the alternatives presented at the public meeting and determine which of those alternatives best meet the need and purpose and the evaluation criteria. Cost and benefit analysis will be considered as part of the evaluation. |
| 05-24-07 Email | Fisher | Abby | After seeing the proposed alignments for the Grand Parkway under Segment H, Section B, I feel that either alignment B3 or B4 would provide the best use as the other alternatives are either too close in proximity to existing major thoroughfares or too far beyond the reasonable scope of development for the foreseeable future. | Comment noted. The study will evaluate all the alternatives presented at the public meeting and determine which of those alternatives best meet the need and purpose and the evaluation criteria. Cost and benefit analysis will be considered as part of the evaluation. |
| 05-24-07 Email | Sullivan | A.J. | I have reviewed the proposed alignments for the Grand Parkway under Segment H, Section B and feel that either alignment B3 or B4 would provide the highest and best use as the other alternatives are either too close in proximity to existing major thoroughfares or too far beyond the reasonable scope of development for the foreseeable future. | Comment noted. The study will evaluate all the alternatives presented at the public meeting and determine which of those alternatives best meet the need and purpose and the evaluation criteria. Cost and benefit analysis will be considered as part of the evaluation. |
| 05-24-07 Email | MacDonald | Craig | I would like to comment on the proposed alignment of Segment H. There is a great deal of sense to using A-5 along the existing FM 1485 and joining it to alignment B-4. This will take the road through forested land as opposed to developed farms or residential areas as would occur with alignments B-1 or B-2. Both B-1 and B-2 cross the floodplain of Luce Bayou at a wide point, whereas B-4 can be aligned to cross at a rather narrow point. This will make construction of the roadway less expensive as more can be built on actual land versus on elevated bridges and causeways. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of alternatives. Items described in the comment will also be addressed in the criteria for evaluating the alternatives. |

SH 99, Segments H & I-1
Second Public Scoping Meeting Series Comments and Responses

| | | | | |
|------------------|----------|--------|--|---|
| 05-22-07 Mail | Mannchen | Brandt | The Houston Sierra Club is opposed to the Grand Parkway. HSC has driven the study area and there is no reason for the GP in the Segments H & I-1 study area. HSC recommends that several alternatives that utilize as much existing road ROW be evaluated in the DEIS. These include 1) FM 1485 to FM 2100 to FM 1960 to SH 146 to IH-10 to SH 99; 2) FM 1485 to FM 2100 to FM 1942 to SH 146 to IH-10 to SH 99; and 3) FM 1485 to FM 2100 to FM 1960 to SH 146 to FM 3360 to IH-10 to SH 99. The Houston Sierra Club sent an eleven page letter with attached supporting documentation. | Please review the need and purpose document that addresses your specific concerns, the document is posted on: www.grandpky.com . Some of the alternatives presented at the meeting utilize existing facilities: FM 1485, SH 146, FM 2100, those alternatives will be evaluated with other alternatives as part of the process. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of preliminary alternatives and in the DEIS and FEIS documents. Indirect and cumulative impacts will be studied for each reasonable alternative and a detailed noise analysis will be performed on the recommended alternative. Any noise impacts will be abated through the use of effective noise abatement measures. |
| 05-24-07 Mail | Cyr | P. | Since it is a limited access toll road its purpose will not serve any needs of the residents of Liberty County. No such route to the north and west across the county is needed by anyone here. It will stifle growth since the routes will be a blight as they cut a swath through attractive buildable land. B1-- Your aerial constraints map is outdated and does not show several water wells in the vicinity of FM 1960 and CR 614 and CR 621. There are now some 40 homes in the area . What access will there be from FM 1960? Some people did not seem to understand what limited access means. You should show proposed access locations, if any. | Comment noted – Access will be provided at points based on further traffic analysis. Major arterials such as FM 1960 and US 90 will have access. Proposed access points will be presented at the next series of meetings. Economic growth and traffic forecasts will be considered for the reasonable alternatives. Updated data will continue to be requested from local agencies and will be utilized if available. Please review the need and purpose document that addresses your specific concerns, the document is posted on: www.grandpky.com |
| 05-29-07 Mail | | | Cleveland City Council on May 17, 2007 discussed the proposed routes and noted in Resolution 05-17-07 supports alternative B1 in section. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of preliminary alternatives. |
| 05-24-07 Mail | | | In resolution 2007-04, the City of Dayton supports B1. | Comment noted. Concerns will be addressed in the evaluation of preliminary alternatives. |