

Meeting Summary

Public Meetings, February 28 and March 1, 2006



The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and The Grand Parkway Association (GPA) are preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for State Highway 99 (SH 99) from US 59 (N) to IH 10 (E), also known as the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1. This project is located on the northeast side of the greater Houston metropolitan area and spans the area from US 59 (N) to IH 10 (E) generally between FM 2100 and SH 146 in Montgomery, Harris, Liberty, and Chambers Counties, a distance of approximately 36 miles. Cities within the project study area include Mont Belvieu, Dayton and New Caney, Texas. Segments H and I-1 are planned as a four-lane, limited access, toll facility within a 400-foot wide right-of-way. SH 99 is a key element of the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan, a transportation program developed by the Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC).

The purpose of this report is to document the activities used to solicit public participations as well as record the input received in conjunction with the project's first series of public meetings held February 28 and March 1, 2006.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

The first series of public scoping meetings was held in two different locations within the study area to provide ample opportunity for interested citizens to attend. The meeting time for each of these locations was 6-8 p.m.

- Tuesday, February 28, 2006, Wilson Junior High School, 309 Highway 146, Dayton, Texas 77535
- Wednesday, March 1, 2006, Barbers Hill High School, 9600 Eagle Drive, Mont Belvieu, Texas, 77580

The purpose of the public scoping meetings was to solicit public and agency input toward the development of the proposed project's purpose and need, objectives, process, schedule, and study area.

ATTENDANCE

Approximately 158 people attended the public meetings:

- Dayton — 97 citizens and 7 elected officials
- Mont Belvieu — 45 citizens and 9 elected officials

Representatives from project team firms were present at both meetings: The Grand Parkway Association, Texas Department of Transportation, HNTB Corporation, The Lentz Group, Wilbur Smith Associates and Cobb Fendley & Associates. Representatives from Trans-Texas Corridor also attended the meetings.

Meeting Summary

Public Meetings, February 28 and March 1, 2006



MEETING FORMAT

Both meetings were conducted in an “open house” format and consisted of various exhibits including maps of the preliminary study area, text informational boards, and large-scale aerial maps. Meeting attendees were invited to review the information at their leisure. TxDOT, GPA and consultant team members were available to answer questions and discuss concerns. Attendees were provided a comment form and encouraged to fill it out and turn it in at the meeting or submit their comments to GPA by mail.

Due to its possible proximity and potential future connection to SH 99 Segments H and I-1, representatives from the Texas Trans Corridor (I-69) displayed their project’s informational boards and were available for questions and comments. The Grand Parkway is a separate and independent project from the I-69 project.

PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

A total of 28 questionnaires were received — 16 from Dayton meeting attendees, 2 from Mont Belvieu meeting attendees, and 10 mailed to GPA. Additionally, 6 email comments and 2 letters were received.

Copies of all comments received are located in Section 7 and written responses to collective comments are located in Section 8 of the Public Scoping Meeting Record. This meeting summary and comment responses will be posted at www.grandpky.com. A full copy of the Public Scoping Meeting Record, including comment responses, will be available for review at Grand Parkway Association, 4544 Post Oak Place, Suite 222, Houston, TX 77027; the TxDOT Houston District Office, 7721 Washington Avenue, Houston, TX 77007 and the TxDOT Liberty Area Office, 209 Layl Drive, Liberty, TX 77575.

The following summarizes the comments received. A full breakdown of questionnaire responses follows this summary.

Study Area Property Owners

The majority of questionnaire respondents (64%) own property within the study area.

Location of Property

Most respondents who own property within the study area are located in zip code 77535 (Dayton, Texas). Other property locations include Crosby, Huffman, New Caney and Mont Belvieu.

Property Type

The majority of property owned by respondents within the study area is residential property. Eight respondents described their property as agricultural, indicating various amounts of acreage (ranging from 6 to 3,630 acres) and lengths of time owned (ranging from 6 to 50 years). One respondent described their property as commercial and there were no respondents that described their property as industrial.

Frequency of Trips

Most respondents indicated they would use the proposed roadway 2-3 times a week.

Meeting Summary

Public Meetings, February 28 and March 1, 2006



Purpose of Trips

The majority of respondents indicated they would use the proposed roadway for non-work related purposes.

Existing Road Serving Same Purpose

Most respondents commented that there is not an existing road that serves the same purpose as the proposed roadway in the study area. Some of the roadways mentioned by other respondents as serving the same purpose include SH 146, Hwy 90, Beltway 8, FM 2100, FM 1942, IH 10 and FM 1314. One respondent commented, “It is very easy to get into Houston with the roads that are already here.”

Area Benefit

The majority of respondents think the project would be highly beneficial to the study area.

Top Concerns

Project concerns repeated most often include concern the project will not begin soon enough, loss of property, location of the route, accessibility of the facility, the facility as an evacuation route and the possibility of the facility spurring economic development for the area.

Purpose and Need

Comments regarding the project’s purpose and need statement varied and included “project is needed now,” “project is a welcome idea” and “not entirely satisfied about the need.”

Project Management Plan

Two respondents commented on the Project Management Plan. The responses were “Good” and “Not Sure.”

Public Involvement Plan

Comments included “very much appreciated,” “want to be involved” and “Huffman needs notification of meetings.”

Meeting Boards/Maps

The majority of comments were positive and included “excellent,” “precise and clear” and “nice detail on maps.”

Meeting Location and Format

Comments included “convenient,” “excellent,” “more advertisement” and “would like speakers and question and answer opportunity.”

Meeting Notification

Most respondents heard about the meetings through advertisements and media coverage.

Additional Comments

Space was given on the questionnaire for additional comments. Comments varied by subject including community concerns, property issues and environmental issues. A categorized summary can be found on the breakdown of questionnaire responses following this summary.

Meeting Summary

Public Meetings, February 28 and March 1, 2006



Number of questionnaires tallied	28
Study area property owner	
Yes	18
No	10
Zip code	
77535 (Dayton)	13
77532 (Crosby)	2
77336 (Huffman)	1
77357 (New Caney)	1
77580 (Mont Belvieu)	1
Property type	
Residential	17
Commercial	1
Industrial	0
Agricultural	8
6 years, 15 acres	2
12 years, 6 acres	1
13 years, 125 acres	1
40 years, 35 acres	1
50 years, 300 acres	1
29 acres	1
3630 acres	1
Frequency of trips	
2-3 times a week	11
Daily	4
Weekends only	4
Unknown	2
More than once a day	1
Seldom	1
Never, don't need it	1
Purpose for trips	
Non-work related	16
To/from work, work-related	11
To/from school	1
Property owner on SH 146 N	1
Tractor sales	1
Travel north of Houston	1
Never, don't need it	1

Meeting Summary

Public Meetings, February 28 and March 1, 2006



Existing roads that serves same purpose

No	12
SH 146	5
Hwy 90.....	3
BW 8.....	2
FM 2100.....	2
FM 1942.....	1
IH 10	1
FM 1314.....	1
Very easy to get into Houston with what is already here.....	1

Area benefit

Highly beneficial	18
Neutral	4
Somewhat beneficial.....	3
Not at all	3

Top project concerns

General Project Concerns

Not starting soon/length of time to complete.....	7
Location of route.....	5
Economic development.....	3
Accessibility	3
Evacuation route	3
Time, money and efficiency to complete project.....	1

Property Concerns

Losing property.....	6
Property taxes	2
Too close to Crown Colony subdivision.....	1
Available ROW space.....	1
Hope it does not affect Whispering Meadows Baptist Church.....	1

Traffic

Relieve congestion on FM 2100	2
Construction delays	1
Traffic flow	1
Impact on FM 1960 between Lake Houston and Dayton	1
Easier access to Houston and metro areas	1
Trip to work	1
Connectivity to other major routes	1

Meeting Summary

Public Meetings, February 28 and March 1, 2006



Environmental/Community Issues

Drainage/floodplain	2
Family owned cemeteries	1
Increase more hazards through the area.....	1
Raise cattle.....	1
Increase in crime rate due to increased housing, economic development	1
Would hurt farmers in this area	1
Have endangered species in trees	1
Changing our way of life	1
Safety	1

Tolling

Proposed tollway	1
Toll would keep some commercial traffic from using.....	1
Toll roads we already have should be sufficient.....	1
Toll will be a problem for locals to pay	1

Route Suggestions

As much as possible in Liberty County	1
Consider east side of the study area to connect to I-69.....	1
Coordinating with I-69 connector on southern part.....	1
Other options closer to Houston could be used	1

Purpose and need comments

Not entirely satisfied about the need.....	1
Good but vague about location of Grand Pkwy and I-69	1
Project is a welcome idea.....	1
Needed as an evacuation route.....	1
Needed now	1
People very friendly and helpful.....	1
Provide connectivity for suburbs	1
Didn't find out much more than I heard 30 years ago	1
Informative, but don't agree we need	1

PMP comments

Not sure.....	1
Good	1

PIP comments

Good	2
Huffman needs notification of meetings.....	1
Very much appreciated; want to be involved	1

Meeting Summary

Public Meetings, February 28 and March 1, 2006



Boards/Map Comments

Excellent	2
Precise and clear	1
Good	1
Very well done.....	1
Very good map	1
Nice detail on the maps.....	1
Great, very informative.....	1
Some markings could not be explained (purple lines, TCEQ info).....	1
Informative	1

Meeting Format/Location Comments

Would like speakers and question and answer opportunity.....	2
Good place for a meeting (Dayton)	1
Convenient.....	1
Excellent	1
Very good	1
Good	1
Relaxed at Barbers Hill High School.....	1
Would have enjoyed a speaker to explain TRA direction and motivations.....	1
More advertisement	1

How did you hear about the meetings?

Ads/Media Coverage	12
Mailing.....	7
Web site	3
Friend.....	1
In bulletin handout.....	1

Additional comments

We need this roadway ASAP.....	3
Look forward to this project coming to fruition	1
Important for evacuation route and area economic growth and stability	1
Area does not need any additional access to Houston	1
Project huge waste of time and money	1

Safety

Will allow for much improved evacuation preparedness	2
--	---

Community Concerns

Avoid family farms and new development.....	2
---	---

Meeting Summary

Public Meetings, February 28 and March 1, 2006



Obtain facet maps to avoid family owned estate and cemeteries in FM 1485/FM 2100 area.....	1
Lakewood Heights in Huffman has many retirees.....	1
Like country atmosphere	1
Please don't take what we have worked so hard for	1
Seems late to determine path as construction now to IH-10.....	1
We are small town people by choice.	1
Grand Parkway needs to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians	1

Environmental Issues

Have eagles nesting in our trees and stocked pond.....	1
Will bring pollution, crime, traffic and urban sprawl	1
Houston Sierra Club is opposed to this project.....	1

Property Concerns

Have land for sale on FM 1960 between Huffman and Dayton, will you come close?	1
Fair compensation if we are bought out.....	1
Need to know if widening SH 146 and how much	1
Don not want this anywhere near our home	1
Will homes need to be purchased east of Crosby?	1

Meeting Materials/Public Involvement

Keep Liberty Vindicator up to date on project	1
Disappointed not a map overlaying the photo of the area	1
Want to see where churches, schools and house are relative to the study area.....	1