



**NEW BRAUNFELS OUTER LOOP TASK FORCE
ELEVENTH MEETING
FEBRUARY 15, 2010
NEW BRAUNFELS CONVENTION CENTER
6:00 - 9:00 P.M.**

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

<p>TxDOT REPS: Jonathan Bean, PE Laura Lopez Maggie Rios</p> <p>ELECTED OFFICIALS: Jay Millikin, Comal County Commissioner</p>	<p>TASK FORCE MEMBERS:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Arthur Brinkkoetter</td> <td>Phillip Schulze</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bennie Bock</td> <td>Roy Linnartz</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brett Reynolds</td> <td>Rusty Brockman</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Connie Krause</td> <td>Suzy Collins</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dean Word</td> <td>Ted West</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Donna Jones</td> <td>Tipton Ross</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gary Cobb</td> <td>Tom Hornseth</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jim Folbre</td> <td>Tom Myers</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Karen Dietz</td> <td>Vincent Schwab</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lenny Llerena</td> <td>Kevin Lehman</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maegan Blaschke</td> <td>Alicia Herrera</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marcie Helmke</td> <td>Martin Levett</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marilyn Altwein</td> <td>Sherry Schneider</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mitch Sacco</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Arthur Brinkkoetter	Phillip Schulze	Bennie Bock	Roy Linnartz	Brett Reynolds	Rusty Brockman	Connie Krause	Suzy Collins	Dean Word	Ted West	Donna Jones	Tipton Ross	Gary Cobb	Tom Hornseth	Jim Folbre	Tom Myers	Karen Dietz	Vincent Schwab	Lenny Llerena	Kevin Lehman	Maegan Blaschke	Alicia Herrera	Marcie Helmke	Martin Levett	Marilyn Altwein	Sherry Schneider	Mitch Sacco		<p>CONSULTANTS: Ximenes & Associates, Inc. Linda Ximenes</p> <p>Kennedy Consulting, Inc. Kevin Kennedy, PE Tony Estes</p> <p>RJ RIVERA Associates, Inc. Rudy Rivera, PE Linda Vela Yobana Díaz William Long</p>
Arthur Brinkkoetter	Phillip Schulze																													
Bennie Bock	Roy Linnartz																													
Brett Reynolds	Rusty Brockman																													
Connie Krause	Suzy Collins																													
Dean Word	Ted West																													
Donna Jones	Tipton Ross																													
Gary Cobb	Tom Hornseth																													
Jim Folbre	Tom Myers																													
Karen Dietz	Vincent Schwab																													
Lenny Llerena	Kevin Lehman																													
Maegan Blaschke	Alicia Herrera																													
Marcie Helmke	Martin Levett																													
Marilyn Altwein	Sherry Schneider																													
Mitch Sacco																														

The meeting followed the agenda set out. To obtain a copy of the meeting agenda, please visit www.nbolstudy.com and click on the “Public Involvement” page. There you will find the agenda and all handouts that were distributed at this Task Force meeting. The following minutes are meant to document the events of the evening in a detailed format. Transcription of public comments are included and made to the extent possible but there is no guarantee of accuracy. These portions of the minutes are indicated and indented.

Agenda Item I - Welcome

Linda Ximenes, the facilitator, convened the tenth meeting of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Task Force shortly after 6:00 PM. She welcomed those in attendance and thanked them for being there.

Agenda Item II: Introductions

Ms. Ximenes asked the Task Force members in attendance to introduce themselves.

Agenda Item III: Review of the Task Force’s Charge

Ms. Ximenes reviewed the charge of the Task Force.

Agenda Item IV: Review the Desired Results of the Meeting

Handout: This information is located at the top of the agenda for this meeting.

- Get acquainted with the Task Force members and their interests
- Finalize the review of the screening process.
- Identify the recommendations regarding the screening process.
- Rank the full body of recommendations from highest to lowest to be able to consider them at the March meeting.
- Review the process to be used at the March meeting.
- Allow for public comment at the beginning and end of the meeting.

Agenda Item V: Review the Agenda

Handout: This information is located at the bottom half of the Agenda for this meeting.

Ms. Ximenes reviewed the agenda for the meeting with the Task Force.

Agenda Item VI: Approval of the Minutes from January 25, 2010

Ms. Ximenes asked for any corrections to the meeting minutes from January 25, 2010.

Marilyn Altwein stated that she would like to have the three reasons given at the January meeting under which federal protection could be achieved for a property. She stated that the minutes from the meeting only list two reasons and she also wanted to list the prime and historic farmland designation as a federal protection for properties.

Agenda Item VII: Comments from the Public

Rittler Strachan

[From Rittler Strachan] [Comments were not recorded for this meeting due to difficulties with the recording equipment. Written comments were submitted by Mr. Strachan to be documented in the minutes.] Many member of the public have mentioned their concerns regarding how the Outer Loop will affect the environment of Comal and Guadalupe counties. RJ Rivera and TxDOT have repeatedly stated that adequate reviews of environmental impacts have been performed for this level of the Outer Loop Study. RJ Rivera sub-contracted an environmental firm, SWCA, for some of these studies. I am submitting a copy of the contract which shows this agreement. Originally for the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study, Judy Friesenhahn was TxDOT's Project Manager and Valerie Collins was TxDOT's Biologist. SWCA, Ms. Friesenhahn and Ms. Collins were all also involved in the environmental study for the Highway 281 toll way.

The November 26th, 2008 San Antonio Express article titled "Firings, reprimands follow tainted study for 281 toll way", reveals that Ms. Collins, TxDOT's biologist, was fired after a lawsuit and an investigation discovered a conflict of interest with SWCA Environmental Consultants, the company her husband works for. Ms. Friesenhahn, TxDOT's Project Manager, was placed on Administrative Leave and later reassigned. I am submitting this article for your review, which reveals other problems with the environmental study aspects of the Highway 281 toll way project.

What is important for you to know is that I, many members of the public and members of this task force have great concerns and little faith in how the environmental aspects of the New Braunfels Outer loop study were conducted. Especially, now that you understand the same TxDOT employees and consultants who were involved in the tainted Hwy 281 toll way environmental study were involved in the environmental aspects of the New Braunfels Outer Loop Study.

A precious as our local environment is to all of us in the room, I pray that you consider this when you make your final recommendation and request more thorough and independent environmental investigations by your local governments prior to their acceptance of this study.

Diane Scharnhorst

[From Diane Scharnhorst] [Comments were not recorded for this meeting due to difficulties with the recording equipment.] Over the phone Ms. Scharnhorst stated her main concern was on the timing of the MAPO meetings. She wanted to know more specifics on the sequence of events that happened for the stakeholder meetings. Her property was impacted by Route 6 but at the next level of screening, the options were renumbered for the next phase and she wanted more information on the changes that took place between those two screening levels and what specifically caused the changes that affected her property.

Agenda Item VIII: Finalize the Review of the Screening Process

Ms. Ximenes introduced Kevin Kennedy to discuss the information regarding cemeteries on the east side.

Information Regarding the Cemetery in Section E

Mr. Kennedy stated that the Lone Oak cemetery does exist and it is in the location where the study team placed it on the constraints map when the options were evaluated at the Refined Universe of Options in August 2007. The Hoffmann Family Cemetery, just south of the Guadalupe River, caused route E12 to be eliminated at the Shortlist of Options in December of 2007. This was immediately prior to making the final recommendation in Section E. The Study Team visited the site last week to confirm that the cemetery was in the location that it was shown on the constraints map. He stated that there were only three routes in total (D17 and D28 from the Refined Universe of Options and E12 from the Short List of Options) that were affected by cemeteries on the east side of the study area.

He stated he would talk about why some of the cemeteries were shown in some exhibits and not on others or were placed in different places. He explained that the cemeteries were in different locations on different maps because the cemetery data that the study team utilized was continuously evolving throughout the duration of the study. The cemetery files that were used at each step were the best available data at the time.

Maegan Blaschke commented that the cemeteries reviewed during the presentation did not include the one in question at the last meeting. She said the cemetery in Section E was the issue. Mr. Kennedy stated that he was trying to be complete in the explanation and wanted to look at the entire east side and all of the routes affected by cemeteries. He stated that the Hoffmann Family Cemetery was brought forth to the study team through the public involvement process and was not on the published data used to identify cemeteries in the study area. He said in his recollection the question was asking why the cemeteries appeared to be moving around and how could the Task Force be assured that the routes were rightfully eliminated because of impacts to those cemeteries if it turned out they were not really there. Mr. Kennedy stated that they went back just last week to verify the location of those cemeteries.

Phillip Schulze stated they were not the cemetery in question.

Mr. Kennedy stated that only three routes were affected by cemeteries and so those were the cemeteries the study team verified again. He stated that throughout the study the team used available published data and input from the public to identify constraints such as cemeteries. The team used available published data and field verified the cemeteries that were identified through the public input process. He stated that in his estimation the data they had was as complete and accurate as it could have been. He said the problem came about when the exhibits were generated for the Task Force meeting using an out of sequence cemetery database in GIS. He stated that when the study was underway the information was used correctly, but as information was taken out of the archive to create the exhibits there could have been wrong data used to make those exhibits.

Mr. Schulze stated that did not answer the question because the final map shows a cemetery on the north side of the Guadalupe River and his question was what side of the river the cemetery was actually on. He said he had this question throughout the study process and never got a straight answer. He said he noticed prior to the last meeting that the cemeteries were moving. He said there was one cemetery he was questioning and was not addressed during the presentation. Mr. Schulze said he talked to the landowner and the landowner informed him that the cemetery was there and was on the north side of the river. He said he got the feeling that Mr. Kennedy did not talk to the landowner to locate the cemetery. He asked if Mr. Kennedy contacted the landowner. Mr. Kennedy stated he did not talk to the landowner.

Mr. Kennedy then pulled out Connie Krause's cemetery maps and asked Mr. Schulze to point out the cemetery he wanted verification of on the north side of the Guadalupe River. Mr. Schulze located and pointed out the cemetery in question on the map. Mr. Kennedy stated that the cemetery Mr. Schulze pointed out was included in the published data used to compile the constraints map that the study team utilized during the study process. Mr. Schulze stated that it was along the recommended route and was very close to it.

Ms. Ximenes asked if it was in the final recommended corridor. Mr. Kennedy stated that according to the information the study team had the cemetery exists and was placed in the correct location and was outside the recommended corridor route. He stated that the exhibits show the cross identifying a cemetery at a much larger scale than they are in reality to prominently show the icon on the map. Mr. Schulze stated he understood the impact of scale but he said the study team said there was a cemetery on the north side of the river and yet that cemetery does not show up on the exhibit that was handed out at the last meeting. Mr. Schulze stated that the cemetery had not been field verified if Mr. Kennedy never spoke with the land owner. Mr. Kennedy stated that the study team used available published data to identify and locate constraints but the Hoffmann Family Cemetery was verified again this week because it was not on the published data.

Mr. Schulze asked why the cemetery in question was not verified. Mr. Kennedy stated that he understood the question to be how the Task Force could be confident that the cemeteries are in the places where they were denoted. Mr. Kennedy stated that he verified the location of the cemeteries that caused options to be removed due to impacts to the cemetery, and the other cemeteries had no effect on the study, so they were placed utilizing published data and were not field verified. Mr. Schulze stated that he would not be surprised if there were other cemeteries that had not been identified and if there is a cemetery identified, future efforts to avoid impacts to that cemetery would have to be made and then he could be affected.

He also stated that there is a historical marker on FM 725 close to the study area and asked if anyone that works and gets paid had stopped to read the historical marker on the side of the road. Mr. Kennedy stated he had not read that specific historic marker. Mr. Schulze stated that the area had all kinds of historical designations and historic markers and why could the whole area not be protected. He said it was not fair that those things are not protected just because they do not meet certain federal guidelines.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the study team utilized available data for all of the constraints including cemeteries. Ms. Ximenes stated that at this level of study the process uses available published data. Mr. Schulze stated that the criteria are inadequate to protect land and that the study team identified only one property that meets the criteria for historic preservation. He stated there were multiple properties that were part of the Family Land Heritage Program which is a Texas Department of Agriculture program, but the study team did not include those because the project was just a land grab. Mr. Kennedy stated he had read some of the certificates and they specifically state that the designation does not protect the land owner from eminent domain.

Mr. Schulze stated he would like to make a recommendation that criteria should be developed locally in New Braunfels and Comal County and should recognize the Family Land Heritage Program as a constraint. Ms. Ximenes stated that could be a recommendation once the Task Force got into small groups and worked on the worksheet.

Ms. Altwein stated that she and her husband attended the MAPO and heard mention of the protection afforded to historic structures, homes fifty years old or older. She said there was no mention of the other qualifications for federal protection. She said they mailed and e-mailed a letter to the study team about their farm which the route will cross. The farm has been in the family since 1863 and the river bottom is pristine and has never been developed. She said there is also a hand dug well on the property. All of these things were pointed out in the letter and e-mailed but the family never received a response. She asked if they should have been contacted by TxDOT after they submitted the information. Mr. Kennedy stated that unless there was something in the information that would have added to the constraints identification that there would be no reason for the study team to contact them.

She said this only came to light since the last meeting because in the last meeting there was a mention of prime and unique farmlands being protected by federal regulations. She asked what it would take to meet this designation since the farm is undisturbed land that had been in the same family for 150 years. Mr. Kennedy stated that he was not an expert but one of the first steps to determine eligibility would be the type of soil in the area. He said the study team obtained the soil surveys and mapped and quantified those that met the first litmus test to being designated a prime and unique farmland which was the soil type. Ms. Altwein stated that information should have been gathered from the letters and emails and they would have appreciated receiving a response from the study team acknowledging receipt of the letters and communication. She said she would also like to have been informed that there were federal protections available to land owners in addition to those afforded to historic sites. She said there were copies of the letters in the study report appendices but the minutes from those meetings were not long.

Martin Levett asked where the study team got the information to map the prime unique farmlands. Mr. Kennedy stated that the study team utilized soil surveys from the Farm Service Administration which has maps broken out by counties. He said the maps also classify all of the different soil types and there are a select few of those that determine prime and unique farmland and then there are other criteria that must be met before the designation is given. Mr. Kennedy stated that about 80 or 90 percent of land cover on the east side has the correct soil classification to pass the first step in being designated prime and unique. He said prime and unique farmland is a very difficult designation to obtain. He said it was similar to how the study identified structures over 50 years of age as potentially historic and made the fifty year mark the quick litmus test for eligibility on the National Historic Register. He said the east side soil classification was mapped but it could not be avoided because it was so prevalent in the area.

Review the Westside Modification

Rudy Rivera stated that data began to be collected in 2007 and throughout the study constraints were investigated to identify things that were important to the community and each one is important to the community. The Study attempted to assess impacts from the route options on those criteria. The charge of the Task Force is to look at what was done for the study. Mr. Rivera stated that a lot of data has been created for the benefit of the Task Force and ultimately the question will be whether what the study did was adequate or if something else should have been done.

Mr. Rivera showed an exhibit from the MAPO meeting on the west side for Section C. He stated that the study team made a recommendation which was taken to the Open House. In response to public input at the Open House there were changes made that affected the recommendation. He said there seemed to be an impression that one house caused the change and he stated that one house never changed the recommendation. At the beginning of the study the very first level of screening was based on impacts to the six critical criteria which the study team considered to be a fatal flaw and would need to be avoided. He stated that to his knowledge, there were no impacts to cemeteries or potentially historic sites known at the time of the study. Mr. Schulze stated that Ms. Altwein had pointed out to the study team that she had a one hundred and fifty year old farm and that was impacted, so the criteria were inadequate.

Mr. Rivera stated that the report is based on the data that was collected and that during the Task Force efforts there has been a lot of data presented. Ms. Altwein stated that the information was furnished at the beginning

of July 2008. Mr. Schulze stated that E15 was never available for public comment and he did not know why some people got a MAPO and some people did not.

Mr. Riviera stated that for the purpose of the study, impacts to homes were considered to be the number one constraint in the study. The study team functioned under the assumption that not all homes would be avoided although early on efforts were made to avoid impacts to extensive and concentrated developments as part of the six critical criteria at the Universe of Options phase.

Ms. Altwein stated that if there had been as many farmers as home owners at the meetings where the criteria were ranked farm land would probably have been the number one criteria. Mr. Riviera stated that was true and that is why the public is invited to public meetings and asked to give their input to the study team as to what criteria were most important to the community. Ms. Altwein stated they were not invited to the MAPO. They heard about it somewhere and so they attended, but they did not know they were affected by the routes. Ms. Alwein stated that there were inconsistencies as to who was invited to meetings because some landowners were invited and others, like her, were not.

Mr. Riviera showed an exhibit of the recommendation that was taken to the Open House and the platted subdivisions around New Braunfels on the same exhibit. He pointed out that there was an impact in Section C that cut through a platted subdivision and that is the portion of the recommended route alignment that was modified after the Open House to avoid impacts to that subdivision.

Dr. Levett stated that in previous presentations on the Section C modification it had been stated that the recommended route for five and a half months, between January 15th and June 25, 2008, was not talked about in the last meeting. He said he was surprised that was not presented at the last meeting. Dr. Levett stated that in reality that was a place where the study team stopped for five months and had selected as the best option before the MAPO change. He stated that in Section B the route goes through five subdivisions and it did not make a difference but in Section C the route was moved to avoid one subdivision. He said a step was left out of the previous presentation and that he had to bring up the modification to get it discussed at this meeting. Mr. Riviera stated that was true. The study team made a recommendation that was taken to the Open House and when public input was gathered at the Open House there was a home being built in a newly platted subdivision that caused the recommended route change. Dr. Levett stated that it had never been mentioned until recently that a platted subdivision was what caused the change in the route. The stated reason for making the change was because of impacts to one home and that was stated in the court reporter's documentation from the MAPO meeting.

Dr. Levett stated that he agreed with Mr. Schulze and that it appeared the study team used criteria as they saw fit.

Mr. Riviera stated that what was shown at the MAPO meeting was the change that took place after the Open House. He showed the currently adopted outer loop alignment with the TxDOT recommended alignment overlaid. He stated that in the area affected by the MAPO meeting, the routes were similar and it was the only area where the two alignments are similar. Dr. Levett stated that could not be used to justify the route in one area because there are other areas where the routes are very divergent. Mr. Riviera agreed that was true and that it would be determined by the city, the county or local agencies to decide what they want to do with the recommendation.

Karen Dietz stated she had sentiments similar to those expressed by Marilyn Altwein. She said this was because the study team met with her family and if the study team had notified them of the change being presented at the MAPO meeting ahead of time it might have generated some good will. She said she recalled Greg Malatek stating at the MAPO meeting that it was one slab that caused the route to change in a way that was more negatively impacting her property. She stated that she would appreciate it if the study team could let people know when a recommended route has been changed in a way that makes a big difference to a family, before they get to the public meeting.

Maegan Blaschke asked if Ms. Ximenes was writing the recommendations down. Ms. Ximenes stated that she was expecting recommendations on the screening process to be brought up in the small group work being done later in the meeting.

Mr. Rivera stated that at the Shortlist of Options, going into the Open House, the study team recommended C1 at the crossing of Hwy. 306. He stated that once the study progressed to the Shortlist of Options, all options are considered good options, but the team had to identify one that would be recommended. He pointed out that at the Shortlist of Options it should have been recognized that there was a platted subdivision, and that was not identified. He stated that at the scale the maps are provided, it can be difficult to tell when slight movements are made which could seem negligible in the exhibits but could cause a change in the matrix as far as number of acres impacted by the alignment.

Mr. Rivera stated that at the Open House the study team became aware of a new home being built in a platted subdivision and the team performed field recognizance to verify the home. Dr. Levett asked if a GPS was utilized to locate the home. Mr. Rivera stated that he did not believe so because GIS was not used for other field recognizance, so he did not expect it would be used in that instance either. Dr. Levett stated he was surprised, because in the testimony it states that one house is what caused the route to be modified. Mr. Rivera stated that he wanted to be clear about this point because the one house did not change the recommendation, but it was the impact to the platted subdivision that caused the change.

Dr. Levett asked why part of the report and the court reporter's transcript states it was the one house and that nothing was mentioned about a platted subdivision as the cause until recently. He also stated that impacts to subdivisions was not listed as criteria for the study and was now being used as a reason for the change. Mr. Rivera stated that he had stated it earlier and wanted to emphasize again that the number one criteria as stated in the Study Report, and which he had shown a slide of with the wording underlined in red, identified impacts to a concentration of homes as one of the six critical criteria. Dr. Levett stated he agreed with the statement, but that it was not one of the criteria although he thought it should be.

Mitchell Sacco stated that platted subdivisions were a criterion from the beginning and was one of the first things looked at. He understood that what got the study team to notice the subdivision was the home being constructed. Mr. Rivera stated that if it had been known during the Universe of Options screening, that option would have been eliminated. Dr. Levett stated that he had not seen that listed as a criterion in any of the documentation.

Mr. Rivera showed an exhibit of one of the maps that was taken to the Open House. It showed where the map had been marked up to point out the new home being constructed. The study team looked at the home and did recognize that it was part of a platted subdivision, so the options in the area were reevaluated to minimize impacts to it. Options C20 and C21 were added and the options were reevaluated. The study team decided to change the recommendation in Section C based on the new information. The study team then went to the MAPO meeting to present the new recommendation for that area.

Dr. Levett stated that there was a west side MAPO matrix that showed options C1 and C2 and asked if that map and matrix were available to show the Task Force. C1 went north of the substation and C2 went south of it. Mr. Rivera stated that the study team developed the C20 option and the C21 option at the IH-35 intersection.

He showed a portion of the MAPO court reporter's transcript where the engineer presenting the information refers to homes and to a platted subdivision. He also stated that the one home in question is not within the recommended route alignment.

Tom Myers stated that he did not understand the rhetoric revolving the one home but there were some good points about the move that was made. As home owners they have given LCRA [Lower Colorado River Authority] land for a transmission line. By changing the recommendation to where it is now it moved most of the major interchange off of the Edwards Aquifer. So if the study team missed a house, in his opinion, moving it

to where it is now does have benefits. He stated he did not like the loop and would prefer to not ever see it, but if it does have to happen then there should be efforts to be as fair to everyone as possible. Mr. Myers stated he would like the discussion to stick to the facts.

Dr. Levett stated that he was talking facts and read the transcript from the MAPO meeting stating that "it is the one house that we found out there that is currently under construction and avoiding homes in the study was the number one criteria." Dr. Levett stated that if you look at the matrix used to make the decision, the matrix shows two homes being impacted but one was misplaced, despite GPS and an onsite visit. He said you also notice that the study recommendation for five and a half months was based on minimizing impacts to certain criteria, so that outweighs the criteria that are improved when you change the recommendation. Dr. Levett stated that if he were a computer he would not have picked the route selected.

Mr. Myers stated that the Task Force was attempting to decide if the study was equitable and he owns a historic ranch and structures and he is not complaining, but does want to be treated as fairly as possible.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the discussion was running long and there were other items on the agenda.

Dr. Levett stated he had another question and referred to question C-6 on the written responses that were provided. He stated that the question asks about the one house which was identified at the Open House as having caused the modification in Section C. The response states that "upon further evaluation data not available to the study team during the study it does appear the residence was put in the wrong location." He said the study team had data and GPS telling them where the house was, but it was still misplaced. Another part of the answer stated that there were "several new homes slated to begin construction" as also being part of the reason for the change in the route. He wanted to know which homes were being referred to and what information was utilized to determine they were slated to begin construction. Mr. Rivera stated that the one house did not make a difference, but the new subdivision was identified with the platting authority.

Tipton Ross asked about a slide presented at the previous Task Force meeting which showed three possible routes south and one route option north of the transmission line. He recalled the explanation given seemed as if the route had been recommended somewhat arbitrarily and he could not understand the justification for the selection. He said it was hard not to take it personally because he lives in the area and the insistence by Dr. Levett to inquire about the cause for the change makes him feel that there are implied sentiments that something unscrupulous caused the change and not the response which has repeatedly been given. Dr. Levett stated that was a personal attack and that happened at the last meeting when the Sunset Commission was brought up. Mr. Ross stated that a response has been repeatedly given and if he does not agree with it, that is fine, but he feels the insistence on the question implies there must be some other reason the recommendation was changed and makes him personally feel like he partook in something underhanded to cause the change. He stated he never met Mr. Rivera until he was asked to participate on the Task Force. He said he had the highest regard for the Pantermuehl family and that Dr. Levett was turning the issue into a battle between good people. Mr. Ross stated he was not on the Task Force to argue his own personal agenda but to look at the process. Dr. Levett stated that he was only utilizing the data because the Task Force is charged with assuring accuracy and consistency and the interpretation from Mr. Ross was not based on anything he had said.

Ms. Ximenes asked Mr. Rivera to quickly respond to the issue. Mr. Rivera stated that a recommendation was taken to the Open House the study team selected the route that had lesser impacts to the Pantermuehl Ranch. At the Open House new information was gathered which caused the change to the recommended route. Mr. Ross asked if there was any other reason aside from the platted subdivision that caused the change. Mr. Rivera stated that the route south of the transmission line also has less impact on the Edwards Aquifer and prime and unique farmland, but the main cause for the change was impacts to the subdivision. Mr. Ross asked if the benefits of the route south of the transmission line were such, why was it not there to begin with and why was an option north of the transmission line selected for the Open House.

Ms. Dietz asked if impacts to large parcels were also a constraint, and when impacts could not be avoided can

consideration be given as to how those impacts affect the ranching or farming operations on the property. Mr. Rivera stated that the study team identified and attempted to minimize impacts to parcels of land larger than 50 acres. Ms. Dietz asked if they could not be avoided and had to be impacted, then was there an attempt to have a discussion with the property owner to try to accommodate the land owner. Mr. Rivera stated that attempts like that were made and the team held several stakeholder meetings similar to the one the study team had with the Dietz family. Ms. Dietz stated that the stakeholder meeting was held prior to the change shown at the MAPO meeting. Linda Vela stated that the study identified an 800 foot corridor and future efforts would also try to minimize the impacts. Mr. Rivera stated that what Ms. Dietz stated was not done for the study.

Mr. Schulze stated he had found a set of criteria that takes a lot of those details into account. He said it was the Farmland Protection Policy Act which uses a detailed list of criteria to evaluate the conversion impact rating for farmland. It uses a scoring system to calculate effects on functionality and all those details and he believed that was an important benefit and would recommend that the ranking criteria be used in the area. The act states that it is advisable that evaluation and analysis of prospective farmland conversion be made early in the planning process and where possible be part of the National Environmental Policy Act process. Mr. Schulze recommends use of the act because it considers impacts on a lot more than just parcel size.

Ms. Dietz asked how the Task Force recommendations would be used and how they would be made known to the decision makers and the public. Ms. Ximenes stated that the recommendations and the rest of the information from the Task Force activities would be included as an addendum to the Study Report. The information would be sent to the governmental agencies. She stated she did not think there would be a presentation to the New Braunfels City Council and the majority of the loop falls within the New Braunfels ETJ.

Ms. Altwein asked if the Task Force would see the recommendations before they are attached to the Study Report. Ms. Ximenes stated that the Task Force would know by the end of tonight what all of the recommendations are and by the March 6th meeting they would know the results of the recommendations since they would be made in a group.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the recommendations made that evening would be made in small groups, which implies there was a willingness of the group to bring that recommendation forth. Those would be added to the recommendations that have been compiled from the beginning of the Task Force process. The recommendations made that night would be added to the compiled list and distributed at the meeting that same evening. The Task Force would then rank the recommendations for discussion at the March 6th meeting and the top ranked recommendations would be discussed first and so on as time permits.

Connie Krause stated that she was not in agreement with submitting the Task Force recommendations without a presentation because all of the time put into the Task Force was important and should not just be submitted in writing since that might not get the attention due to it from the municipalities to which they are submitted.

Ms. Blaschke asked who would present the recommendations. Ms. Ximenes stated that as the facilitator she would write the report and would also make the presentation. Ms. Blaschke asked if Ms. Ximenes felt that was a worthwhile effort. Ms. Ximenes stated she would be willing to make a presentation, but it was not her decision whether to make a presentation or not. She stated if the Task Force made a request for a presentation to be made that would need to be considered.

Mr. Ross asked if when the municipalities discuss the information if TxDOT would be available to respond to questions. Mr. Ross asked if the Study Report had already been submitted and if there was a presentation or in-person appearance when the information was discussed. Jonathan Bean of TxDOT, stated TxDOT would be willing to make a presentation to the municipalities but that a presentation was not made when the Study Report was distributed.

Dr. Levett asked if there had been changes to the Study Report based on the inaccuracies that had been found during the Task Force efforts or if there would be an explanation. Mr. Bean stated that there is a current recommendation and the Task Force has been going over the study process. Dr. Levett asked if the

inaccuracies found would be corrected and presented along with the information. Ms. Vela stated that the materials created for the Task Force include all of the discussion for the Task Force and would also be included with the report written and submitted to the municipalities. Mr. Bean stated that the process would continue for as long as the loop is identified on the Major Thoroughfare Plan. It is an evolving process and the changes from the Task Force would be added as an addendum to the report and future phases would also build on the work done to date.

Dr. Levett asked where the idea came from to rank the top 15 recommendations. Ms. Ximenes explained that she determined this because the March 6th meeting would be from 9 AM to 4 PM which would mean the Task Force would have a total of six working hours. She allotted 20 minutes of discussion for each recommendation and divided the 6 hours by the 20 minutes and that would allow for 15 recommendations. Dr. Levett stated that the recommendations are not limited because if they take less than 20 minutes then more recommendations could be discussed. Ms. Ximenes agreed with him, pointing out that was also why all of the recommendations would be ranked and the Task Force would get through as many as possible.

Bennie Bock stated he had not been to a meeting where there was not some question whether the engineering study has been competent and complete and met the criteria that it set out. He stated they would be asked to make recommendations when they have not discussed whether they like the information they have gone over to date. He suggested that an important question was not addressed which was to ask the Task Force if they were satisfied with what they had seen and if they felt comfortable making recommendations.

Ms. Ximenes asked if that was a proposal. Mr. Bock stated that it was.

Ms. Dietz stated she also had a proposal that went along with the statement from Mr. Bock. She proposed that in addition to the recommendations the Task Force addendum should also include a minority statement where the Task Force members and alternates, regardless of their stand on the loop, who continue to have concerns about the ability of the Task Force to meet their charge: to ensure technical accuracy; to assure data used to evaluate options was sufficient; and to ensure that screening tools were applied consistently throughout the study area. The minority report could indicate that there was not full concurrence with the consensus document as designed. She felt that would give members who still have concerns and questions a vehicle to voice those concerns and still allow the Task Force to make recommendations.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the report would reflect all the different concerns raised, not just denote places where there was agreement. The intention of the report is to include all of the different perspectives. She stated that rather than doing a minority statement she would ask Task Force members who have those concerns to indicate them to her and she would incorporate them into the report. Ms. Dietz asked how that would be documented in the report. Ms. Ximenes stated that the recommendations would be worked though in a group and the Task Force would take a few minutes to have a discussion, test for consensus and at the eighteen minute mark there would be another test for consensus. If at that time there were still persons who were not in agreement, then their concerns would be noted along with the recommendation.

Ms. Dietz stated she had reviewed all of the recommendations and thought they were all good and very thoughtful. She stated they represent a lot of thoughtfulness on the part of the Task Force and she did not anticipate a great deal of disagreement about them when reaching consensus. She proposed the minority report to provide Task Force members an opportunity to say they did not believe they were able to complete their charge. Ms. Ximenes stated that in places where Task Force members felt that they were not able to complete their charge they could submit that in writing to her and it would be incorporated into a section of the report so that all of the documentation could stay in one place.

Dr. Levett stated that he did not believe they were able to complete their charge and he is concerned because his and all of their reputations are on the line. He agreed with Ms. Dietz that there was a need for a minority report that included words to the effect of "we believe we could not complete our charge for the following

reasons...” He stated that history judges you on what you did when you knew and he would like the opportunity to say that he did not agree with what was done.

Ms. Dietz stated she would bring the proposal up again at a later time.

Ms. Blaschke stated that there was about an hour and a half left in the meeting and asked if it would be a better use of time to review the recommendations they had made to date rather than doing the small group work. Instead the Task Force could write their recommendations on the screening process on the evaluation form and submit them that night.

Ms. Ximenes stated small group work was important in her estimation because some members of the Task Force are very comfortable speaking in a large group but others prefer to work in smaller groups and are more vocal in smaller groups. Another benefit of the small group work is that when recommendations are made in a small group they are somewhat vetted by the small group and have already had some discussion and refining before they are presented to the entire group.

Ms. Blaschke stated that the format she suggested would also accommodate Task Force members who were not comfortable speaking up in the larger group because they could write their recommendations on the evaluation form. Dr. Levett stated that was also a benefit of the minority statement because someone may not want to speak up but they can use the minority statement to voice their disagreement.

Dr. Sacco recommended that the group move forward in the format recommended by Ms. Ximenes. Ms. Vela stated that there are many ways to format the meeting but the way that Ms. Ximenes structured the meeting allowed the Task Force to complete the recommendations tonight and have all of the recommendations with them by the end of the meeting.

Mr. Bock stated that all the issues revolve around whether Task Force members have confidence in the report or not. He asked that there be a vote of confidence on the study and if it fails then there would be no need to make recommendations and we could just go back to the currently adopted loop.

Mr. Ross asked if what Mr. Bock was saying was determining if there was general agreement whether the Study Report was so riddled with errors that there would be no hope of fixing it or determining if TxDOT and the Study Team seemed to have done a reasonable job although there appear to be mistakes. He asked if those were the two positions Mr. Bock would like to have a temperature taken on. Mr. Bock agreed that was the case and if it turned out that the majority does not think the study is accurate, then why would they go through with the recommendations. Ms. Dietz stated that the recommendations attempt to address the concerns where there are shortcomings in the study and are things the Task Force suggested to strengthen the study.

Mr. Bock asked if the idea was to have people critique certain points of the study and part of that would be corrected and other parts would not be corrected; that did not make sense to him. He said it would be helpful to get a vote of confidence on the report as a whole. Ms. Ximenes stated that the charge was not to accept the report or not but to ensure at the accuracy of the data, ensure information was applied equally and to make recommendations. Mr. Bock stated that is what he is asking for. A general statement about whether the Task Force believes the report is accurate.

Ms. Ximenes asked Mr. Bock to put his recommendation in the form of a proposal. Mr. Bock stated he proposed the Task Force take a vote as to whether or not there is consensus that the data presented to date is accurate or not accurate. And if the vote is in favor of accurate data, then proceed to recommendations and if not, then it is over and no recommendations would be made. Ms. Ximenes stated that the study team has already acknowledged that there have been errors. Mr. Bock stated that was precisely why he would like to determine the Task Force’s general perception of the accuracy of the report.

Ms. Altwein stated she reviewed the meeting minutes from the past meetings and that it is not a black and white issue; there are some good points and some questionable points.

Ms. Krause stated she did not agree with taking a vote of confidence and if it did not pass then you throw out the recommendations. She stated that the Task Force spent a lot of time working on recommendations which have value because in future projects TxDOT will recognize that those issues are important to Comal County. She stated the recommendations would be important for this reason and would also benefit future projects in the area.

Ms. Blaschke stated she agreed with Ms. Krasue and that was why she wanted to discuss the recommendations the Task Force had already made and submit recommendations on the screening process in writing to be discussed at the next meeting.

Mr. Ross asked when the recommendations would be utilized since it is not feasible to use them for this project. Ms. Ximenes stated the recommendations would be submitted to TxDOT to take into consideration not only for this loop or for Comal County but for future projects. Mr. Bean stated that the recommendations would be taken into consideration for the TxDOT San Antonio District, but they are also part of the study history of the New Braunfels Outer Loop. Mr. Ross asked if that meant that the future phases referred to for the loop project would also gain from the recommendations and also any other project in the San Antonio district would utilize the recommendations. Mr. Bean stated that was correct.

Dr. Levett emphasized that the key word he heard was “future” and he was concerned about this outer loop. He stated some of the recommendations would only affect future phases of the loop and he was more concerned with recommendations that could affect this loop. Ms. Ximenes stated that as the loop gets constructed the recommendations would be used in future phases. Mr. Bean also stated that it was important to consider that all of the recommendations being submitted would be included in the report whether or not there is consensus reached. Because all recommendations are going to be included, he stated that the Task Force should rank recommendations they would like to have discussion on with a high rank as opposed to ones that would be easy to reach consensus on.

Mr. Myers made a comment regarding the proposal to have a vote of confidence and stated that it would not make a great deal of difference if everyone was for it. He stated that since there was only one meeting left taking a vote now would give all persons an indication of where the Task Force stands on the issue and he agreed that there was a need for a vote of confidence.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the proposal at hand was seeking consensus on whether the study report data was deemed to be accurate and consistent or not and to move forward with the recommendations in either case. Rusty Brockman asked if Mr. Bock’s proposal also included the recommendations. Ms. Ximenes stated that Ms. Krause added that portion to the original proposal. Mr. Brockman stated that since the recommendations would be used for many purposes in the future many different groups could be meeting to discuss future portions of the loop and could also make use of the recommendations. He stated that some of the important work done over the last twelve months was to develop the recommendations, which could communicate with those future groups what the Task Force worked on. He stated that for that reason it would be good to include the recommendations into the proposal from Mr. Bock, but he was not sure.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the proposal asked if the data in the report was accurate and consistent or not and that does not affect whether recommendations are made. Ms. Ximenes asked for a temperature on the proposal.

Mr. Ross stated that before temperature was taken he wanted to point out that it is already known that there were errors in the study and that it is not inconceivable since it is not possible to remove human error from such a large effort. He said the proposal begs the question whether the process is so flawed it should not be considered or if there was a reasonable explanation for why the route was selected notwithstanding the

problems. He stated that in his mind that is what he was basing his vote on and asked if that was the essence of the proposal from Mr. Bock. Mr. Bock stated that was not correct.

Suzy Collins stated that the Task Force should focus on the first proposal before moving on to other discussions.

Ms. Ximenes stated that a temperature would be taken on the proposal and if there are any downward or sideways thumbs then the discussion would attempt to modify the proposal until all parties agree with the proposal.

Mr. Bock stated that what he was calling for was a simple up or down vote. He wanted to ask the Task Force if they thought the report was accurate or not.

Dr. Levett stated that it was understandable there would be errors in such a large effort, but he was uneasy about what other errors there could be that had been missed and are not yet known. He said of the 23 homes impacted two have been misplaced and that is a twenty percent error, so he felt uncertain about what other errors have not been uncovered.

Ms. Ximenes took a temperature on the proposal. She asked for those that have thumbs to the side to express what would need to change in the proposal to gain their agreement.

Dean Word stated that he felt the proposal might need to be broken up into two parts. One would be whether it is accurate and two would be whether it is consistent.

Mr. Brockman stated something needed to be added to the end to indicate that there have been corrections made, discussions had and recommendations have been made to correct some of the inaccuracies and inconsistencies. He stated there have been inaccuracies and inconsistencies but the whole thing was not so flawed, and he was not comfortable with the wording of the proposal.

Ms. Collins stated that it is known that the study had inaccuracies and inconsistencies and the Task Force was making recommendations to revisit what was inaccurate and inconsistent.

There was a statement that RJRA was resisting including input from the Task Force into the Study Report. He stated that there should be a fixed data set and decisions should be based on the level of public data available at the time. You cannot keep chasing the answer and complete a study. He asked if the data set was considered complete enough for the study purposes and once the Study Report is finalized, additional information would not be usable in the study. Ms. Vela stated that the study effort had been finalized and the Study Report is complete. She said the study did use a snapshot of data which was then utilized for the study efforts but the Task Force could recommend that future efforts look at updating the data which is now available. She said it was important for the Task Force to make recommendations on the screening of options.

Dr. Levett stated that in question B-1 on the responses provided in writing showed a home that was in the route alignment but had not been counted. Ms. Ximenes stated that those specific questions had all been gone over and the discussion at hand was over the proposal made.

Ms. Altwein asked when the recommendations would be presented to City Council and if the Final Study Report had already been submitted. She stated she thought the final report was going to be presented to City Council after the Task Force had concluded and she felt that the recommendations being made now might not hold as much weight at City Council since they had already received the report.

There was a comment that since the Study Report documentation had been submitted to municipalities then they should be notified of the inaccuracies that have been discovered. Ms. Ximenes stated that type of

information would be included in the Task Force addendum to the Study Report. The recommendations made on March 6th would also be included.

Ms. Blaschke asked when the Task Force would get a list of the inaccuracies that have been found that would also be included in the Task Force addendum. Ms. Ximenes stated that those have been worked on throughout the Task Force process.

Ms. Altwein asked when the municipalities received the Study Report. Mr. Bean stated that the Study Report and appendices were delivered to the municipalities. Ms. Altwein asked if it was just delivered or if there was a meeting held to present the information. Mr. Bean stated that they were submitted with a letter. Jim Folbre stated that the City of Santa Clara did not receive a copy. Mr. Bean stated that he recalled they had mailed them the information, but they would submit the information again.

Ms. Ximenes asked for a temperature on the proposal. She asked if there were any modifications that could be made to the proposal to gain consensus from the group.

There was a suggestion to add a caveat statement that the engineers of the study acknowledge that there could be inaccuracies or inconsistencies in the report that was submitted and that perhaps a protocol could be developed for when an inaccuracy is discovered to correct the information.

Ms. Vela stated that as consultants their role was to outline what was done for the study and the Task Force was then to work on recommendations to make improvements. She stated there has been a lot of discussion during the course of the meeting but with only thirty minutes left there should be a focus by the Task Force on making recommendations on the screening process.

Ms. Blaschke stated that she had suggested that the recommendations on the screening process be included on the Evaluation Form so that they could continue the discussion at hand. She stated that even though it was not on the agenda, the study team should have flexibility in allowing the Task Force to have the current discussion because it was important. Ms. Ximenes stated the discussion was going to be allowed and the would be concluded, but she emphasized the time dedicated to small group work was also important and had a benefit to the group. Ms. Blaschke stated that writing the recommendations on the Evaluation Forms had the same benefit as having small group work since Task Force members could write their recommendations on the form without having to speak up in the larger group.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the modification of the original proposal added language to include a protocol for addressing inaccuracies in the data. Dr. Levett expressed concern over the proposal's ability to address inaccuracies that were not known.

Mr. Rivera asked if there were any statements from the Task Force members with expertise in planning and engineering on the definition of "accurate" or "consistent" to provide the Task Force with a different perspective on how they could get a better handle on what constitutes accurate and consistent for a regional planning study of this magnitude.

Roy Linnartz stated he was concerned because the Study Report had already been submitted to municipalities that they could be under the impression the report was flawless. He stated it would be important to communicate the need for leeway on the part of the adopting agencies to make corrections as they see fit during implementation of portions of the loop, especially during the platting process to allow for modifications as new information is considered. Mr. Rivera stated that the process utilized for the study allowed for that type of flexibility in future phases.

Mr. Schulze asked if the best place for an 800-foot corridor was the best place for a 250-foot wide road. He asked why the route was not evaluated based on actual right-of-way needs instead of the width that was assigned and used for evaluation. Mr. Rivera stated that would be done in future phases and the study process

was designed to allow for that. Mr. Rivera stated that the purpose of the study was to allow the municipalities to preserve right-of-way if there was development in the area affected by the outer loop alignment. He stated that there were no funds allocated for construction of any portion of the loop and the corridor would be utilized to preserve right-of-way when development happens.

Mr. Ross asked if any of the inaccuracies or inconsistencies that had been found would cause any changes in the currently recommended route alignment. Mr. Rivera stated that they would not and that no new information discovered during the course of the Task Force would change the recommendation. Mr. Ross stated that the addendum would list the inaccuracies or found inconsistencies and the planning authorities considering adopting the recommendation could take that in weight with the recommendation, knowing that the study team did not consider any of the found inaccuracies or inconsistencies would change the recommended alignment. Mr. Rivera stated again that the primary purpose of the study was to designate a corridor that could be preserved by the platting authorities when development happens.

Mr. Ross asked what the proposal being discussed was. Ms. Ximenes stated the current proposal included a caveat that a protocol should be developed to address inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the report. Mr. Ross stated he had an issue with the wording because it had just been stated that none of the known inaccuracies or inconsistencies would cause a change in the recommendation. So City Council or a platting authority could make any change or modification they would like, so it is not necessary to include the wording on the protocol to address the inaccuracies or inconsistencies.

Dr. Levett stated that the Task Force had not seen all of the materials he had submitted because a map that showed houses that had disappeared had not been distributed. He stated that on the written responses the map he had submitted was not shown and was replaced by another map. He also submitted a letter from the City of New Braunfels that states the City of New Braunfels did not ask for the study and that had also not been distributed. Ms. Ximenes stated that the process developed to distribute information to the Task Force had been established and a synopsis should be submitted for the Task Force's consideration and they could then ask for the information. Dr. Levett stated that when the question was answered the information should have been presented. Ms. Vela stated that the response to the question given did not include the map submitted because the study team could not verify where the map was generated. The letter referred to was from the City of New Braunfels and states that no official record could be found of an official request for the study but there would probably not be an official request on file and requests could also be made at the staff level and those would not be officially documented. Dr. Levett asked why the letter was not distributed and that the map he submitted was gained through a freedom of information act request. Mr. Brockman stated that those issues should be included in the recommendations.

Ms. Ximenes said the proposal being discussed included a caveat that there are inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the report and that there should be a protocol developed for correcting the known inaccuracies or inconsistencies in the Study Report.

Ms. Krause asked who would develop the protocol for correcting the inaccuracies or inconsistencies in the Study Report. Ms. Ximenes stated there would not be time in the meeting to vote on that.

There was a modification suggested to the proposal that would allow each authority to develop a protocol to correct inaccuracies or inconsistencies in the Study Report since it would be their final decision. Ms. Krause stated that in that case it would be less likely to happen because of the bureaucratic red tape.

Brett Reynolds stated that he agreed with the prior comment from Mr. Word to break the proposal down into two separate proposals. He stated that you could recognize that there are factual errors or inaccuracies in the report but would that make the whole report inconsistent so he did not want to link both statements together into one proposal. Ms. Ximenes took a temperature on the first part of the proposal.

Dr. Levett asked for a definition of caveat. Ms. Ximenes stated that it would be a statement included in the report.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the original proposal asked whether there was a belief by the Task Force that the data in the Study Report was accurate and consistent. A caveat statement was added that indicates there are known inaccuracies in the Study Report and that each platting authority should develop a protocol for correcting the inaccuracies in the Study Report. Dr. Levett stated that the original proposal also addressed inconsistencies and asked if that would be included. Ms. Ximenes stated there was a suggestion to break that into two statements for accuracies and inconsistencies. Ms. Ximenes stated that would need to be a separate discussion.

There was a comment that there needed to be a more fundamental level of understanding regarding the volume of the report and there was a tremendous amount of haggling within the Task Force over about three miles worth of the loop route. He stated that you could pick something apart forever and never be satisfied but the discussion needs to be framed in a context where a level of accuracy can be determined for the overall study efforts. He said it had been stated the study was not 100 percent accurate, but what level of accuracy could be attributed to the study proceedings?

Dr. Sacco suggested adding the words, "in general" after data in the proposal. So then the proposal would read "There was a feeling on the Task Force that the data, in general, in the Study Report was accurate and consistent. A caveat statement would be added in the Task Force addendum that indicates there are inaccuracies in the Study Report and that each platting authority should develop a protocol for correcting the inaccuracies in the Study Report."

A temperature was taken on the proposal. Tom Hornseth suggested adding a statement to the proposal saying that "the known inaccuracies do not affect the recommended alignment." He noted that it was stated earlier that the known inaccuracies do not affect where the recommended alignment is placed. Mr. Ross stated he suggested something similar but that would only be the study team's opinion and it would be up to each platting authority to determine their action to adopt or not or to make modifications to the recommendation made.

Ms. Dietz stated that the charge of the Task Force was to ensure technical accuracy, assure data used to evaluate the options was sufficient and to ensure screening tools were applied consistently throughout the study. She said the Task Force was assembled under that charge and the last year of effort would be futile if it were up to someone else how the recommendations were used. She stated that the recommendations would not be able to ensure that all of the concerns expressed over the last year would be represented in the recommendations. She asked how the Task Force could access the effectiveness of the protocols that the platting authorities would develop to correct the inaccuracies and inconsistencies.

Ms. Vela stated that she could not imagine that any planner could undertake any future studies of the loop and not take into consideration the work and input given by the Task Force. She stated that all of the information that was created as part of the Task Force effort would be submitted with the Task Force addendum. Ms. Ximenes stated that the Task Force addendum would include a report that outlined what the Task Force had done and also outline and identify inaccuracies. She stated that the recommendations would serve to improve the process from here on out since you cannot affect the study retrospectively; they would be applied moving forward. Ms. Dietz stated that was why one of her recommendations was to have Ms. Ximenes give a presentation to the municipalities with the information since as Ms. Krause had stated earlier the message could get lost if the materials were submitted without a presentation.

Ms. Ximenes stated that the meeting was out of time and asked that Task Force members should include their recommendations on the screening of options on their Evaluation Form. She stated that the proposal would need to be taken up at the next meeting since the discussion was not finalized.

Ms. Krause stated that she wanted to make the Task Force aware that there was a Land Trust Workshop on conservation easements would be held on March 5th from 1 to 7 pm at the Fayette County Ag Center which would provide information on how a land owner could protect their property. She stated that the event was put on by various entities so it was not a specific group running the agenda but would be an informative event for those wanting to know more about conservation easements.

There was a request to have a vote on the proposal before the meeting concluded. A temperature was taken. There were 10 thumbs down, 3 thumbs sideways and 10 thumbs up.

Ms. Ximenes again asked the Task Force to include any recommendations on their Evaluation Form.

Agenda Item IX: Identify Recommendations for Improving the Screening Process

Small Group Work

This portion of the agenda was not completed because of time constraints.

Reports from Working Groups

This portion of the agenda was not completed because of time constraints.

Agenda Item X: BREAK: (Compile the screening process recommendations with the other recommendations.)

This portion of the agenda was not completed because of time constraints.

Agenda Item XI: Rank the Recommendations

This portion of the agenda was not completed because of time constraints.

Comments from the public

There were two people signed up to speak (Nancy Krueger and Reese Ann Mauner). Ms. Nancy Krueger said the meeting had run long and she did not make a comment. Ms. Mauner stated what she really wanted to know was if thumbs up or thumbs down by the Task Force members meant they thought were inaccuracies. Ms. Ximenes stated that thumbs up meant that the data was generally accurate and you agree there should be a caveat statement and each platting authority should develop a protocol for correcting the inaccuracies in the report.

Agenda Item XII: Adjourn

Ms. Ximenes thanked all of those in attendance for participation. The meeting was then adjourned.