

**New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force  
Meeting #10 (January 25, 2010): Meeting Evaluation Forms Tally**



	Agree	Disagree	No Comment
<b>A total of 15 Meeting Evaluation Forms were received.</b>			
1. The objectives for this meeting were clearly articulated.	13		
2. The stated objectives for this meeting were met.	10	1	2
3. I felt that my time was valued and utilized well.	8	4	1
4. The handouts/presentations were appropriate and helpful.	11	2	
5. The information from speakers/presenters was clear and informative.	9	1	3
6. The facilitator was well prepared and fair to all viewpoints.	10	1	2
7. The facilitator was helpful in framing the issues and process of the meeting.	10	1	2
8. I believe the topics were covered adequately in the time available.	9	2	2
9. There was sufficient time for public comment.	10	2	1
10. Task Force communications (i.e., materials, calls, logistics and other information) are being handled effectively.	9		4
11. The meetings are convenient and conducive to our work (i.e., meeting time, meeting length, location, audio visual, acoustics, overall meeting space).	11	1	1
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.	8	2	3

**Comments regarding questions (above):**

Evaluation Form 10:

Question 7: Please stop the derogative personal comments immediately. People know the policies and should respect them.

Evaluation Form 13:

Question 12: Not sure yet.

Evaluation Form 14:

Question 2: Not all questions answered

Evaluation Form 14:

Question 4: Westside modification not shown

**Comments:**

- There was sufficient time for public comment but during the meeting there was 2 questions I felt were not answered or rushed through.
- Kevin did great.
- I feel it is important to verify all factors, features etc which predicate the various recommended routes.

I do appreciate the detail explanation of certain historical features.

- \*I believe it is up to TxDOT & their representatives are the ones responsible for contacting the land/home owners and not the other way around. Simply sending an invitation is unsatisfactory. They should have tried in numerous ways to meet with them personally.

\*Check with Texas Lutheran University for March (all day) meeting place.

- New Braunfels Children's Museum has meeting rooms.
- Explanation by Kevin Kennedy good, very patient w/explanations of why route were there or if access to other side of road would/could be done. The areas around the 46 for E & D seemed difficult to explain.

Wish Martin had not verbally attacked Rudy about home by Karen Dietz home. Than you Tipton for telling Martin to stop the infatic accusational corrections.

I hope next meeting we get to go over all information quickly and effectively without all the accusations.

Try T-M resort on Hw 46 for March meeting they hold a lot of meeting groups – have good food and large areas for small conventions and meetings.

- Remove Texas Ski Ranch as a Park

Kevin should have included pictures like Rudy to show Task Force members area.

Recommendation

- 1) Make sure to state charge of task force and state that it was not charge of the talk force to build or not to build the loop
- 2) When recommendations are printed I would like to see the names of member who do not agree to specific recommendations

Geronimo Community Center  
Comal County Senior Center

- When meetings are longer (3 hrs+) it might be helpful to schedule at least a 10 min “stretch break” out of consideration for task force members' comfort.

#8, 4 It will be helpful to revisit Section C for a brief time. I would like to see the impact of the interchanges (for each possible facility type) on the surrounding properties to get a more accurate picture of the impact of this proposal. (306) (102) As in pg 57 (8.4.3) Final Report – It is possible to show this as an overlay on maps?

#6 Although it may have been convenient to our schedule, I was sorry the farmer whose large farm was impacted did not have more opportunity to ask his questions. The emotional toll to so many is very real, not to mention the future financial toll – we need to be as respectful as possible to these persons in our community and not just tolerate their valid concerns.

After repeatedly hearing how all attempts were made not to divide parcels of 50 acres or more it is disappointing to say the least to see so graphically demonstrated the departure from that principle in respect to at least 2 large parcels of ranch/farm land where engineers have drawn ROW in such a way to make those operations difficult at best. To hear a Task Force member compare 25 – 30 acre parcels compared to 500 acres as being equally defined as “working ranches” was very hard.

Persons who live on smaller parcels often do not rely on those parcels for their income and livelihood. For TxDOT to defer to those interests at the expense of working farms & ranches is wrong. We hear of the need to preserve greenspace, honor the recharge zones & contributing zones for the aquifer, etc. & then have to see those interests compromised for Loop ROW & future development.

#12

Recommendation: When a stakeholder individual or family is visited by TxDOT engineers or representatives and given opportunities to voice concerns or to work out possible alternatives I would request a follow-up visit or at least a phone call to the stakeholders if none or few of their concerns are met BEFORE they are confronted by the changes at a public MAPO meeting. This would seem to be a common courtesy on TxDOT's part.

Earlier, especially during the first Task Force Meeting series, we would hear "no build" was always an option. Is that still on the table? The size of the projected facility for New Braunfels seems excessive. What is the larger purpose – can we discuss this in terms of a larger Regional Transportation Plan?

- - I recommend Task Force members go to the New Braunfels Outer Loop website, go to the "Study Overview" section (listed in the upper left area), scroll down to Section C and pull up the map (Section C – Recommended Corridor – In blue print). Know the yellow dot next to the C in C1 is misplaced (See Question C-6 → under "Public Involvement", then Task Force Meeting #9, then "Section Specific Questions" then scroll to Question C-6 and look at the map of page 13 of 23 to see the proper location of the "home in question"). Also read the text under Section C which "had the least residential displacements" (not true when house is properly located) "and impacts to prime farm land" (which is also not correct if you compare Route 7 with Route 8 M (modified), since C1 goes through Residential lots and C2 goes through farm land – all the rest of the route being equal. With that said that the numbers in the matrix under "minimize impacts to Prime/Unique farmlands" are obviously not correct either). Continue scrolling down the "Study Overview" section and pull up the map on "West Side Modification" (in blue print) to see the detailed map of this same area. The "house in question" that caused this portion of the route to move (C1 to C2) (see the court reporter transcript of their MAPO meeting to verify) just fits on the C1 route because it is much larger than the other dots and misplaced. This was never discussed during Rudy Rivera's discussion of the C-Section. Rudy Rivera stated that Route 7 had been eliminated early on, but eventually it was the recommended route in Jan-April 2008, until the June FM 306 MAPO meeting/West Side Modification changed that. Also look at the matrix to see how the numbers don't make sense which "minimize impacts to Prime/Unique farmlands." Now can there be more acreage affected by going through a ranch than through residential vacant lots? Notice also how the numbers themselves, between the 2 matrices, have changed while the routes between the 2 maps have not.

Once again I question the accuracy of the data, and the consistency which it was applied. Thank you for your time and effort in reviewing this material and attempting to meet the changes we have been tasked. M. Levett, MD, MRA

- I attended for the purpose to represent the Historical Commission. Laura West unable to attend. My first meeting and evaluation based on this meeting with no prior background.