



Task Force Meeting #11 – General Questions from Meeting #9 and #10 February 15, 2010

General Questions		
From	Question	Response
G-93 Comment Card, Mtg #9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anonymous 	One task force member stated that at one time several members voted “no build” concerning the outer loop. Is this possible and if yes, will the city officials consider this option? Before this should be officially adopted, fix FM 306 and the Railroad crossings that are a major problem that the loop will not fix.	See response to G-18 and G-46.
G-94 Comment Card, Mtg #9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nancy Kreuger 	Section. Why is the outer loop not going between the landfill and the wildlife on Kohlenberg. The landfill entrance is not on Kohlenberg. The loop will certainly benefit the landfill and wildlife if it is on Kohlenberg. I am sure Waste Management would be willing to donate land from the wildlife ranch. That would also show Waste Management being a good neighbor to the community. The wildlife ranch is being established. We were told current roads would be used and not cut property in half (stock tanks, barns, prime farmlands, etc.).	See response to G-62 and G-93.
G-95 Evaluation Form, Mtg #9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marilyn Altwein 	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?	1. See response to G-67. 2. See response to G-74, G-76 and G-91. Notices are sent updating officials when the meeting schedule changes and prior to each meeting. Agency staff who participate on the Task Force also keep their leadership apprised of Task Force proceedings.
G-96 Evaluation Form, Mtg #9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anonymous 	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	1. The process for evaluating options in Section B were covered in Task Force Meeting #9 held in December of 2009. Please refer to the minutes of this meeting for more information. The minutes for this meeting can be found on the project website at www.nbolstudy.com and click on the ‘Public Involvement’ tab and scroll

General Questions

From	Question	Response
	<p>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.).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>down to see the attachments for Meeting #9 called "Minutes".</p> <p>2. The currently adopted New Braunfels Thoroughfare Plan can be found online at http://www.nbtexas.org/DocumentView.aspx?DID=1368</p> <p>3. See response to G-28, G-39 and G-63.</p> <p>4. The New Braunfels Thoroughfare Plan is authorized by the City Council of the City of New Braunfels.</p> <p>5. Please see response to G-50. For more information on the Comal County Regional Habitat Conservation Plan please visit: http://www.co.comal.tx.us/ComalRHCP/default.htm</p>
<p>G-97</p> <p>Comment Card, Mtg #10 • Sandra Elbel Taylor</p>	<p>Why would you cross Schwarzlose? Go on the W side of the landfill – go on the East side – impact fewer people crossing on the East.</p>	<p>See response to G-93.</p>
<p>G-98</p> <p>Comment Card, Mtg #10 • Sandra Elbel Taylor</p>	<p>The whole thing is a joke – who picked the task force (Schell)?</p>	<p>See response to G-13(2).</p>
<p>G-99</p> <p>Comment Card, Mtg #10</p>	<p>Seems some land owners talked to the Rivera Assoc? So why didn't we all get to talk to them to sway them our direction?</p>	<p>See response to G-4.</p>

General Questions

From	Question	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandra Elbel Taylor 		
G-100 Comment Card, Mtg #10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frank Dietz 	Who is served by this expensive masterpiece of engineering dream (or is it boondoggle or taking) for sake others?	See response to G-22.
G-101 Comment Card, Mtg #10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nancy Krueger 	1) Why cut through prime Historic Farm/Ranch Property, stock tanks, which are needed for cattle? 2) Why not use existing roadways in Section D, such as Kohlenberg Rd (between) WM Landfill and their so called Wildlife Preserve? The roadway there would be beneficial for landfill & wildlife preserve. 3) Going along Alligator Creek on FM 758 is questioned?	1) See response to G-7, G-11, G-28(1) and G-44. 2) See response to G-62 and G-93. 3) See response to G-76 and G-85.
G-102 Evaluation Form, Mtg #10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Dietz 	#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?	Please see response to C-1.
G-103 Evaluation Form, Mtg #10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Dietz 	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?	See response to G-93.