

## CHAPTER 8: AGENCY AND PUBLIC COORDINATION TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>8.1</b>	<b>NOTICE OF INTENT .....</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<b>PROJECT COORDINATION PLAN .....</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.3</b>	<b>SCOPING AND STUDY AREA .....</b>	<b>8-2</b>
8.3.1	Public Involvement .....	8-2
	8.3.1.1 February – March 2006 Public Scoping Meetings .....	8-2
8.3.2	Local Elected Official Involvement.....	8-3
8.3.3	Participating Agency Involvement .....	8-5
	8.3.3.1 January 2006 .....	8-6
	8.3.3.2 February 2006.....	8-6
	8.3.3.3 March 2006 .....	8-6
	8.3.3.4 May 2006 .....	8-7
<b>8.4</b>	<b>ALIGNMENT STUDY .....</b>	<b>8-7</b>
	8.4.1.1 May 2007 Public Scoping Meetings .....	8-7
	8.4.1.2 August 2011 Public Hearings .....	8-9
	8.4.1.3 May 16, 2013 Meeting with Affected Property Owners.....	8-10
8.4.2	Local and Elected Officials Involvement.....	8-12
	8.4.2.1 April 2007 .....	8-12
	8.4.2.2 May 2007 .....	8-12
	8.4.2.3 July 2007.....	8-12
8.4.3	Participating Agency Involvement .....	8-13
	8.4.3.1 April 2007 .....	8-13
	8.4.3.2 May 2007 .....	8-14
	8.4.3.3 June 2007 .....	8-14
	8.4.3.4 July 2007.....	8-14
	8.4.3.5 August 2007 .....	8-14
8.4.4	Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Expert Panel Survey.....	8-15
<b>8.5</b>	<b>ADDITIONAL COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>8-16</b>
8.5.1	Community Groups .....	8-16
8.5.2	Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program.....	8-16
8.5.3	Website .....	8-17
8.5.4	Section 4(f)/Chapter 26 Public Hearing on the Lake Houston Wilderness Park De Minimis Impact Determination .....	8-17

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 8-1:	Local Elected Officials Involvement During Scoping and Corridor Study .....	8-4
Table 8-2:	Participating Agency Involvement During Scoping and Corridor Study .....	8-5
Table 8-3:	April 26, 2007 Meeting Attendees.....	8-12
Table 8-4:	July 18, 2007 Meeting Attendees .....	8-13
Table 8-5:	April 18, 2007 Meeting Attendees.....	8-13
Table 8-6:	July 16, 2007 Meeting Attendees .....	8-14
Table 8-7:	Expert Panel Survey Participants .....	8-16



1 prepared to meet the requirements of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A  
2 Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), Title VI, Section 6002, and was formally approved by FHWA on April 13,  
3 2007. Refer to **Appendix B** for a copy of the approved Project Coordination Plan for the Grand Parkway  
4 Segments H and I-1 Project.

5  
6 The Project Coordination Plan identifies which participating/cooperating agencies were included for the  
7 proposed project and their respective roles and responsibilities. Participating/cooperating agencies consist  
8 of federal and state resource agencies and local agencies with jurisdiction by law, special expertise, or an  
9 interest in the proposed project. All federal, state, tribal, regional, and local government agencies that may  
10 have an interest in the project were invited to serve as participating agencies. Cooperating agencies are  
11 federal participating agencies that have been invited by the lead federal agency, FHWA, to serve as  
12 cooperating agencies in the process to assist in the preparation, coordination, and review of the EIS. The  
13 United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is a cooperating agency for this project. A detailed list of  
14 the proposed project's participating and cooperating agencies is included in the Project Coordination Plan  
15 (**Appendix B**).

## 16 17 **8.3 SCOPING AND STUDY AREA**

18 Scoping involved an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for  
19 identifying the issues related to the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1. A preliminary study area was  
20 identified through an interdisciplinary approach involving active agency participation and an outreach  
21 program. The scoping and outreach process included the involvement and participation of the public, local  
22 officials, resource agencies, and other interested parties. The following summarizes efforts for scoping and  
23 the corridor study phase of Segments H and I-1 of the Grand Parkway.

### 24 25 **8.3.1 Public Involvement**

#### 26 **8.3.1.1 February - March 2006 Public Scoping Meetings**

27 The public was directly involved in the development of a study area for the Grand Parkway Segments  
28 H and I-1. Initial public scoping meetings were held at Wilson Junior High School in Dayton, Texas, on  
29 February 28, 2006, and at Barbers Hill High School in Mont Belvieu, Texas, on March 1, 2006.

30  
31 Public meeting legal notices were printed in English in the *Houston Chronicle*, the *Conroe Courier*, the  
32 *Liberty Vindicator*, and the *Baytown Sun* approximately 30 and 10 days prior to the event. The legal notice

1 was also published in Spanish in the *Houston Chronicle's* Neighborhood News Zone 3. Public meeting  
2 announcements were also mailed to approximately 1,000 people two weeks prior to the meetings. The  
3 mailing list was comprised of property owners, individuals, businesses, and civic and neighborhood  
4 organizations within the preliminary study area, along with government officials, media, and other  
5 stakeholders. TxDOT mailed public meeting notices with informational packets to elected officials  
6 approximately 35 days prior to the public meetings. Press releases were sent to local news media  
7 approximately one week prior to the meetings.

8  
9 A combined total of approximately 158 people attended the meetings, which were conducted in an open  
10 house format and consisted of various exhibits including maps of the preliminary study area, text  
11 informational boards, and large-scale aerial maps. TxDOT, GPA, and consultant team members were  
12 available to answer questions and discuss concerns. Attendees were provided a questionnaire/comment  
13 form and encouraged to complete and turn it in at the meeting or submit their comments to GPA by mail.

14  
15 Comments provided and questionnaires completed at the public scoping meetings were used in  
16 combination with comments from local officials and resource agencies to develop the study area for  
17 Segments H and I-1 and to gather information on environmental constraints. Most respondents  
18 commented that there is “not an existing road that serves the same purpose,” and the majority think the  
19 project would be “highly beneficial” to the area. During the meetings, the principal concerns identified for  
20 Segments H and I-1 were:

- 21 • Project would not begin soon enough to accommodate growth;
- 22 • Need for improved emergency evacuation route;
- 23 • Could positively impact the area with increased economic development;
- 24 • Accessibility and location of route; and
- 25 • Loss of personal property.

### 26 27 **8.3.2 Local Elected Official Involvement**

28 One-on-one meetings were held with local elected officials to discuss the proposed project's purpose and  
29 need, constraints in the study area, process, public involvement plan, and schedule. All of the elected  
30 officials that met with the study team were supportive of the proposed project and were pleased to see it  
31 moving forward. Specific issues from these meetings were used in combination with public and resource  
32 agency comments to develop reasonable alternatives for Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1. **Table 8-1**

1 provides meeting dates, a list of elected officials or agency attendees, their comments and concerns, and  
 2 their affiliations.

3  
 4

**Table 8-1: Local Elected Officials Involvement During Scoping and Corridor Study**

Affiliation	Attendees	Comments/Concerns	Date
Chambers County Precinct 3	Commissioner Buddy Irby	Concerned about Cherry Point subdivision. Enterprise was going to build a brine well or storage well.	February 9, 2006
Liberty County Precinct 4 City of Dayton	Commissioner Norman Brown Mayor Steve Stevens	Salt Dome north of Dayton- companies looking to expand usage. County Road (CR) 615 at State Highway (SH) 321 - Enstore putting 70-80 acre storage facility. Mobile home community expanding Whitewing subdivision. Residential development west of FM 1413 between County line and FM 1413. Steamboat subdivision already subdivided.	February 9, 2006
City of Mont Belvieu	Mayor Nick Dixon; Bryan Easum, City Administrator; and Daniel Wouldiams, City Engineer	Concerned about Cherry Point subdivision. Would like an intersection at Langston, intersection every 0.5 mile. Development is occurring along FM 3360 and SH 565.	February 14, 2006
Montgomery County Precinct 4	Mark Bosma; Mike Beitler; and Mark Mooney, County Engineer	The Montgomery Independent School District has many parcels in the area.	February 16, 2006
Harris County Precinct 4	Commissioner Jerry Eversole; and staff Pamela Rocchi and Joanye Henderson	Interested in benefits to Harris County residents.	February 27, 2006
Chambers County Precinct 4	Commissioner Bill Wallace and Don Brandon, County Engineer	Proposed 50-acre cemetery south of Cherry Creek. New development planned along Cedar Bayou (20,000 acres). Union Pacific Rail Road (UPRR) putting another yard on FM 565. Dayton canal parallel to SH 146 is historic.	March 30, 2006
Harris County Precinct 2	Commissioner Sylvia Garcia; and staff Kim Harrison and Roel Garcia	Proposed soccer park at FM 1942 and North Main Banana Bend Beach Park need to add on constraint map, Cemetery at the Lynchburg Ferry area. New high school at North Main and Wallisville Road. Need to visit with Goose Creek, Channel View and Sheldon Independent School District (ISD) to avoid impacts to facilities.	April 3, 2006
City of Baytown	Gary Jackson, City Manager; Bob Leiper, Deputy City Manager; Bill Pederson, Director of Engineering; and Mike Prewitt, Assistant Director of Public Works	Need to get all planned development from Greg Stubbs (Planning Department).	April 18, 2006
City of Woodbranch	Mayor Sharon Frey; and Charlotte Smith	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) bringing housing to Patton Village for Katrina Evacuees. Large tract near Roman Forest being cleared for development.	April 27, 2006
City of Splendora	Mayor Wayne Careley	Super Wal-Mart planned on SH 242 west of United States Highway (US) 59 North (N), lots of development along SH 242. Patton Village. goes under water all the time.	May 17, 2006
City of Roman Forest	Mayor Floyd Jackson and Mary McFarland, Roman Forest Municipal Utility District (MUD); Billy Goss, New Caney MUD; and JD Marshall, Roman Forest Council Member	Kings Colony is starting to see sporadic development, it is platted. Property on the corner of Roman Forest and US 59 (N)/I-69 is for sale asking \$35 million.	June 1, 2006

5 Source: Contract Meeting Report, Volume 1, 2006; and Administrative Record, Volume II., 2006

6

**8.3.3 Participating Agency Involvement**

Coordination with various participating agencies indicated that a number of issues needed to be addressed before a set of preliminary alternatives could be developed. These issues included timeline, traffic data, travel demand modeling, constraints mapping, and impact on environment. One-on-one meetings were held to brief agencies about the proposed project’s purpose and need, constraints in the study area, process, public involvement plan, and schedule. **Table 8-2** provides meeting dates, locations, and attendees.

FHWA, TxDOT Houston and Beaumont Districts, TxDOT Environmental Affairs Division (ENV), GPA, and the consulting engineer team serve on a streamlining team known as the Fast-Track Advisory and Streamlining Team (FAST) to assist in streamlining and expediting project development. The FAST provided guidance throughout the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and assisted in the preparation and review of documentation. The FAST participated in periodic meetings to review decisions made, provide comments on materials, methodologies, and evaluation criteria. The team members that comprise the FAST are listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix B**).

**Table 8-2: Participating Agency Involvement During Scoping and Corridor Study**

Date	Location	Attendees
January 24, 2006	Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC) Office	H-GAC and engineering consultant team
February 15, 2006	TxDOT Beaumont Office	TxDOT Beaumont and engineering consultant team
February 22, 2006	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Galveston	USACE, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), TxDOT and engineering consultant team
March 2, 2006	Hermann Park Clubhouse	TPWD, City of Houston, and engineering consultant team
March 7, 2006	H-GAC Office	H-GAC, TxDOT ENV, FHWA, GPA, and engineering consultant team
March 16, 2006	Dayton High School Cafeteria	TCEQ, public, and engineering consultant team
May 2, 2006	TxDOT Houston District	TxDOT Houston, TxDOT Beaumont, TxDOT ENV, FHWA, GPA
May 3, 2006	USACE, Galveston	TxDOT Houston, TxDOT Beaumont, TPWD, TCEQ, USFWS, EPA, General Land Office (GLO), USACE, and engineering consultant team

Source: Contract Meeting Report, Volume 1, 2006; and Administrative Record, Volume II, 2006

1 **8.3.3.1 January 2006**

2 On January 24, 2006, a meeting took place with the Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC) to discuss  
3 travel demand modeling support. Information obtained from the meeting indicated that H-GAC did not have  
4 the year 2030 model network, only year 2025, which cannot be modified as 2030 and would have to be  
5 linked up to the conformity network. However, 2030 demographics have been set.

6  
7 Additional information indicated that the network can be modified if there are obvious errors and that  
8 Interstate 69 (I-69) is not in any of the H-GAC models.

9  
10 **8.3.3.2 February 2006**

11 On February 15, 2006, a meeting took place in which the TxDOT Beaumont District expressed concern  
12 over coordinating Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 with other projects in the area, including the  
13 proposed I-69 project.

14  
15 On February 22, 2006, a joint evaluation meeting was held at the USACE, Galveston office. The agencies  
16 present were FHWA, TxDOT, GPA, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Texas Parks and  
17 Wildlife (TPWD), Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), U.S. Environmental Protection  
18 Agency (EPA), and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service  
19 (NOAA Fisheries). Principal issues of concern included the avoidance of impacts to previous mitigation  
20 sites; pristine waters; ecologically sensitive streams; and endangered species such as the bald eagle,  
21 osprey, red-cockaded woodpecker, and Texas prairie dawn.

22  
23 **8.3.3.3 March 2006**

24 On March 2, 2006, a meeting was held to discuss the status of the Lake Houston Wilderness Park transfer  
25 from TPWD to the City of Houston. Representatives from the City of Houston Parks and Recreation  
26 Department and TPWD were present. To provide better access to the park, TPWD agreed to allowing the  
27 use of land in the northern portion of the park for an alignment that would follow on or near existing Farm-  
28 to-Market Road (FM) 1485. This action would require the preparation of a Section 4(f) statement, which is  
29 included in **Appendix J**.

30  
31 On March 7, 2006, a meeting was held with the H-GAC to discuss traffic and air modeling issues in order to  
32 develop consistent horizon years for the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).  
33 The group jointly decided to use years 2019 and 2039 as the Estimated Time of Completion (ETC), and

1 ETC + 20 years, respectively, for the traffic, air, and noise modeling for the Grand Parkway Segments H  
2 and I-1. It was agreed that these would be the horizon years, based on 2025 demographics in the plan that  
3 was current at the time of the meeting and that these years had already been modeled and data was  
4 available under the current model.

5  
6 On March 16, 2006, project team members attended a TCEQ public meeting to gather and document  
7 information regarding a potential State Superfund Site, the Cox Road Dump site, located 1 mile north of FM  
8 1413 on the west side of County Road (CR) 491 (Cox Road), Dayton, Liberty County, Texas.

#### 9 10 **8.3.3.4 May 2006**

11 A FAST meeting was held on May 2, 2006 at the TxDOT Houston District Office to gather input on the  
12 preliminary alternatives and the technical methodology for the alternatives analysis. Items discussed  
13 included the beginning and end points for the alternatives and constraints mapping. Input from FHWA  
14 during the meeting indicated the need to keep an alternative end point west of Mont Belvieu along I-10 (E).

15  
16 On May 3, 2006, a joint evaluation meeting was held at the USACE, Galveston, to discuss the preliminary  
17 alternatives development process and technical methodology. Various resource agencies were present  
18 including EPA, TCEQ, USACE, USFWS, TPWD, and the General Land Office (GLO). The meeting  
19 focused on various environmental issues such as endangered species, floodplain crossings, and mitigation  
20 sites. All agencies present indicated that the alternatives development process was satisfactory.

## 21 22 **8.4 ALIGNMENT STUDY**

23 Alternative alignments were developed within the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 study area to meet  
24 the purpose and need of the project and minimize potential environmental impacts. The study area data,  
25 supplemented with field-collected data, was used as a guide to determine the alignments that provided the  
26 best opportunity to avoid and minimize adverse environmental effects. The following section summarizes  
27 outreach efforts conducted during the alignment study phase.

### 28 29 **8.4.1 Public Involvement**

#### 30 **8.4.1.1 May 2007 Public Scoping Meetings**

31 The public was invited to participate in the alignment study through a second series of public scoping  
32 meetings held within the study area. The first of these public scoping meetings was held at New Caney



1 High School, in Porter, Texas, on May 8, 2007, and the second meeting was held at Eagle Pointe  
2 Recreation Complex in Mont Belvieu, Texas, on May 9, 2007.

3  
4 Public meeting legal notices were printed in English in the *Houston Chronicle*, the *Conroe Courier*, the  
5 *Liberty Vindicator*, and the *Baytown Sun* approximately 30 and 10 days prior to the event. Additionally,  
6 display ads were placed in community newspapers, the *East Montgomery County Observer*,  
7 *Humble/Kingwood/Atascocita Observer*, and a Spanish ad was placed in the *Houston Chronicle's* Spanish-  
8 language publication *La Voz de Houston*. Public meeting announcements were also mailed to  
9 approximately 1,300 people two weeks prior to the meetings. The mailing list was comprised of property  
10 owners, individuals, businesses, attendees that signed in at the 2006 public scoping meetings, civic and  
11 neighborhood organizations within the study area, as well as government officials, media, and other  
12 stakeholders. TxDOT mailed public meeting notices with informational packets to elected officials  
13 approximately 35 days prior to the public meetings. Press releases were sent to local news media  
14 approximately three weeks prior to the meetings. The GPA and TxDOT websites were also updated with  
15 the meeting information.

16  
17 A combined total of approximately 180 people attended the meetings, which were conducted in an open-  
18 house format and consisted of various exhibits including maps of the preliminary alternatives, text  
19 informational boards, and large-scale aerial maps. Public input was solicited to aid in the development of  
20 the project. Materials presented at the meetings included the following: Project Coordination Plan,  
21 schedule, alternatives development methodology, the universe of alternatives, preliminary alternatives, and  
22 reasonable alternatives.

23  
24 The total number of preliminary alternatives shown included five alternatives in Section A, eight alternatives  
25 in Section B, and seven alternatives in Section C. A map of the study area and these alternatives  
26 accompanied the comment form given to attendees. In addition, the preliminary alternatives that were  
27 selected as recommended reasonable alternatives included three alternatives in Section A, five alternatives  
28 in Section B, and six alternatives in Section C (**Exhibit 2-4**). Project documents including the Project  
29 Coordination Plan, purpose and need, and the first series public scoping meeting records were available for  
30 review. TxDOT, GPA, and consultant team representatives were available to answer questions and  
31 discuss concerns. Attendees were encouraged to complete comment forms and submit them at the

1 meeting or to the GPA by mail. A total of 72 comments were received; 55 at the meetings and 17 via mail  
2 and e-mail.

3  
4 Only two respondents commented on the No-Build Alternative, one citing a positive opinion toward the No-  
5 Build Alternative and the other expressing no opinion. In Section A, the majority of respondents indicated  
6 that these alternatives did not concern them or they had no opinion. Alternatives A-2, A-4, and A-5  
7 received the most positive feedback. In Section B, Alternatives B-1, B-2, and B-3 received the most  
8 positive feedback. In Section C, Alternatives C-2, C-3, and C-6 received the most positive feedback.

9

#### 10 **8.4.1.2 August 2011 Public Hearings**

11 Two similar public hearings on the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 DEIS were held on August 9 and  
12 11, 2011, at Barbers Hill High School in Mont Belvieu and New Caney 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus in New Caney,  
13 respectively. The public hearings were conducted in two locations throughout the project area for the  
14 benefit of the local stakeholders and the public. The two hearings were conducted in the same manner and  
15 had the same information available for the public in an open-house format from 6 to 7 p.m. with a  
16 presentation starting at 7 p.m. The DEIS was posted online and was available for public review at seven  
17 locations at least 45 days prior to the public hearings. These locations included:

- 18 • Grand Parkway Association, 4544 Post Oak Place, Suite 222, Houston, TX, 77027;
- 19 • Texas Department of Transportation, 7600 Washington Avenue, Houston, TX, 77007;
- 20 • Houston Public Library (Texas Room) 500 McKinney, Houston, TX, 77002;
- 21 • Montgomery County Library, R.B. Tullis Branch, 21130 U.S. Hwy. 59 #K, New Caney, TX,  
22 77357;
- 23 • Harris County Library, Kingwood Branch, 4102 Rustic Woods, Kingwood, TX, 77345;
- 24 • Jones Public Library, 307 West Houston Street, Dayton, TX, 77535; and
- 25 • West Chambers County Library, 10616 Eagle Drive, Mont Belvieu, TX, 77580.

26

27 The Notice of Availability of the DEIS for review and comment was published as follows:

- 28 • *Houston Chronicle* – June 24, 2011;
- 29 • *Texas Register* – June 24, 2011; and
- 30 • *Federal Register* – June 24, 2011.

1 Legal notices for the public hearings were published in English and in Spanish 30 and 10 days prior to the  
2 hearings, in newspapers having a general and local area circulation. The notices for the public hearings  
3 were published as follows:

- 4 • *Houston Chronicle* – June 24, July 10, and July 31, 2011
- 5 • *Baytown Sun* – July 13 and July 31, 2011
- 6 • *La Subasta* (Spanish) –
  - 7 ○ North Central – July 12, 2011
  - 8 ○ North East – July 14, 2011
  - 9 ○ August 2 and August 4, 2011
- 10 • Your Houston News –
  - 11 ○ Cluster 3 (*Kingwood Observer, Humble Observer, East Montgomery Observer*) – July
  - 12 13, July 14, August 2, and August 4, 2011
  - 13 ○ Cluster 4 (*Atascosita Observer, Dayton News, Lake Houston Observer*) – July 13, July
  - 14 14, August 2, and August 4, 2011
- 15 • *Liberty Vindicator* – July 14 and July 28, 2011

16  
17 Public hearing notices were also mailed to the elected officials within the study area, adjacent property  
18 owners, and the mailing list of people who had registered to participate. Verbal comments were recorded  
19 at the public hearings and written comments were accepted at the hearings and via mail or e-mail until 10  
20 business days following the hearings, up to and including the date of August 22, 2011. Comments received  
21 on the DEIS were considered in the selection of the preferred alternative.

22  
23 Verbal comments were given to a court reporter in a private room by eight attendees at the two public  
24 hearings. The court reporter recorded 12 speakers (three public officials and nine members of the general  
25 public) on both nights. A total of 14 written comments were submitted during the public hearing sessions.  
26 Two written comments were mailed/e-mailed during the comment period for a total of 16 written comments  
27 that can be reviewed in **Appendix Q**.

### 28 29 **8.4.1.3 May 16, 2013 Meeting with Affected Property Owners**

30 The Meeting with Affected Property Owners (MAPO) was held to present a proposed minor design  
31 modification that is under consideration since TxDOT and FHWA issued the Draft Environmental Impact  
32 Statement dated March 2011, and to receive public comment. The MAPO primarily focused on the

1 proposed modification which occurs north and south of FM 1960; however, comments regarding any other  
2 features of proposed Grand Parkway, SH 99, were accepted.

3  
4 The proposed minor design modification involves a slight shift in the Recommended Alignment beginning  
5 2.15 miles north of FM 1960 and ending 1.41 miles south of FM 1960 for a total distance of 3.56 miles.  
6 This minor shift in alignment is in response to public comments and intended to reduce impacts in the  
7 proposed project area. The MAPO was held on Thursday, May 16, 2013 from 5:00 to 7:00 pm at the  
8 Dayton High School, 3200 N. Cleveland St. (Hwy 321), Dayton, Texas 77535.

9  
10 Meeting notices were mailed to affected property owners and elected officials. An announcement of the  
11 meeting was also posted on the Grand Parkway Association website at [www.grandpky.com](http://www.grandpky.com).

12  
13 Meeting attendees signed in at the registration table. A total of 16 individuals were in attendance, as well  
14 as, two elected officials. Copies of the attendance sign-in sheets are included in **Appendix O**.

15  
16 The meeting was held as an open-house format between 5:00 pm and 7:00 pm. Representatives from  
17 TxDOT and the study team were available to discuss the project and answer questions. The open house  
18 was arranged with aerial exhibits and a welcome board. Copies of the exhibits are included in **Appendix O**.

19  
20 Throughout the meeting, attendees had the chance to submit written comments. Comment tables were set  
21 up in the meeting area with comment drop boxes. Written comments could also be mailed or email by May  
22 30, 2013. A total of 5 written comments were submitted within the comment period. Copies of the written  
23 comments and a comment response matrix are included in **Appendix O**.

24  
25 The following is a tabulation of the written comments received as a result of the MAPO:

26 Issue (Number of comments concerning issue)

- 27 • Support of alignment shift (3);
- 28 • Oppose alignment shift (2); and
- 29 • Consider a route further to the east (2).

**8.4.2 Local and Elected Officials Involvement**

**8.4.2.1 April 2007**

Letters were sent to the elected officials listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix B**) inviting them to a coordination meeting held on April 26, 2007, at the GPA office. The local elected officials and their representatives were given an opportunity to review and provide input on the presentation materials prior to the second series of public scoping meetings for Segments H and I-1. Elected officials or their representatives that attended and their affiliations are listed in **Table 8-3**.

**Table 8-3: April 26, 2007 Meeting Attendees**

Affiliation	Attendees
Harris County Precinct 2	John Saavedra, staff member
Harris County Precinct 4	Pamela Rocchi, staff member
Liberty County	County Judge Phil Fitzgerald

Source: Elected Officials Sign-in Sheet, April 2007

**8.4.2.2 May 2007**

The City of Dayton held a city council meeting on May 21, 2007, in Dayton, Texas. The study team made a presentation to the mayor and the council members that included the information shown at the second series of public scoping meetings held on May 8-9, 2007. The information also included the project schedule, development process, constraints map, universe of alternatives, preliminary alternatives, and recommended reasonable alternatives. The preliminary alternatives were displayed on a large board and the preliminary alternatives were described. Comment forms were provided to each of the council members and the commenting process was explained, including the May 24, 2007 deadline for submitting comments to be included in the Official Public Meeting Summary Report. A resolution was adopted stating that the City of Dayton recommended Preliminary Alignment B-1 for the proposed Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1.

**8.4.2.3 July 2007**

Letters were sent to the elected officials listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix B**) inviting them to a coordination meeting held on July 18, 2007 at the GPA office. The local elected officials and representatives of local elected officials met with the project team to discuss input gathered from the May 8-9, 2007 public scoping meetings, draft reasonable alternatives, and alternative analysis methodology. Elected officials or their representatives that attended and their affiliation are listed in **Table 8-4**.

**Table 8-4: July 18, 2007 Meeting Attendees**

Affiliation	Attendees
City of Dayton	David Douglas, City Manager; Jenny Page, City Secretary; Felix Scappa, Councilman; Dave Draz
City of Mont Belvieu	Bryan Easum, City Administrator
City of Roman Forest	Mayor Floyd Jackson
Dayton Independent School District (ISD)	Greg Hayman
Harris County Judge's Office	Mark Annas
Liberty County	County Judge Phil Fitzgerald
Liberty County Precinct 4	Commissioner Norman Brown, Randy Bivins
Tarkington ISD	John Kirchner
Texas State Representative John Otto's Office	Terri Bivins
Dayton News	Mike George
Citizen	Ray Stuessen
Citizen	Kenneth Voytek

Source: Elected Officials Sign-in Sheets, July 2007

### 8.4.3 Participating Agency Involvement

During the preparation of the DEIS, meetings were held with participating agencies to address specific concerns and provide updates on the project development process. The participating agencies consisted of resource agencies and local agencies with a special interest in the proposed project (**Appendix R**). Summaries of the meetings are listed below.

#### 8.4.3.1 April 2007

Letters were sent to the participating agencies listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix B**) inviting them to a coordination meeting held on April 18, 2007 at the GPA office. The participating agencies were given an opportunity to review and provide input on the presentation materials for the second series of public scoping meetings for Segments H and I-1. Agency meeting attendees and their affiliations are listed in **Table 8-5**.

**Table 8-5: April 18, 2007 Meeting Attendees**

Affiliation	Attendees
Chambers County	Don Brandon, County Engineer
Chambers-Liberty County Navigation District	Pudge Wouldcox
City of Houston Parks and Recreation	Rick Dewees, Joe Turner
Harris County Toll Road Authority	Shweta Arora, Page Rander
Houston Airport System	Carlos Ortiz
NOAA Fisheries	Rusty Swafford
TPWD	Amy Hanna
USACE	John Machol
U.S. EPA Region 6	Michael Jansky

Source: Agency Sign-in Sheets, April 2007

1 A meeting with the H-GAC and the study team was held on April 25, 2007 to discuss recent updates to the  
 2 travel demand model and timing issues due to an updated schedule and to coordinate modeling support  
 3 from the H-GAC.

4  
 5 **8.4.3.2 May 2007**

6 On May 21, 2007, the TCEQ Project Manager of the Cox Road Dump Site was contacted to discuss the  
 7 potential impact of the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 preliminary alternatives. The TCEQ advised  
 8 that a 0.5-mile avoidance buffer around the contaminated site would be a comfortable distance away from  
 9 the site for the alternative alignments.

10  
 11 **8.4.3.3 June 2007**

12 The study team met with the H-GAC on June 7, 2007 to discuss coordination for the travel demand  
 13 modeling of the reasonable alternatives.

14  
 15 **8.4.3.4 July 2007**

16 Letters were sent to the participating agencies listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix B**) inviting  
 17 them to a coordination meeting held on July 16, 2007 at the GPA office. The participating agencies were  
 18 given an opportunity to review and discuss the draft reasonable alternatives, alternative analysis technical  
 19 methodology, and input gathered from the May 8-9, 2007 second series of public scoping meetings.  
 20 Agency attendees and their affiliations are listed in **Table 8-6**.

21  
 22 **Table 8-6: July 16, 2007 Meeting Attendees**

Affiliation	Attendees
Chambers County	Don Brandon, County Engineer
City of Houston Parks and Recreation	Joe Turner
Harris County Toll Road Authority	John Tyler
Houston Airport System	Wouldiam Zrioka
Houston-Galveston Area Council	Roland Strobel
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Edith Erfling

Source: Agency Sign-in, July 2007

23  
 24  
 25 **8.4.3.5 August 2007**

26 On August 3, 2007, coordination letters were sent to the participating agencies unable to attend the July 16,  
 27 2007 meeting, including the TPWD, USACE, and EPA to update them on the materials presented. The

1 coordination letters included the presentation materials and maps from the participating agency meeting  
2 and requested their input on the materials.

3  
4 The project team historians met with TxDOT ENV on August 10, 2007 to discuss the findings of the  
5 preliminary historic resources survey. Items discussed included the historic resources identified within the  
6 study area and the approach and methodology of the survey. TxDOT ENV indicated that they would  
7 accept the agreed upon approach of conducting a preliminary survey for the reasonable alternatives and  
8 that a full reconnaissance survey would be performed for the preferred alternative, pending availability of  
9 access.

10  
11 The project team met with H-GAC planning staff on August 11, 2007 to discuss development forecasts as a  
12 result of the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 for the indirect and cumulative impacts assessment.  
13 Maps of the indirect and cumulative impacts study areas along with existing and proposed development  
14 were discussed. The H-GAC provided information on the capabilities of their forecasting models but  
15 declined to provide quantitative input on areas of potential future development as an indirect result of the  
16 proposed project.

#### 17 18 **8.4.4 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Expert Panel Survey**

19 In late 2008 and early 2009, formal surveys were sent to the original stakeholders queried during 2007 and  
20 early 2008 and to additional planning experts identified in late 2008 and early 2009. The expert panel  
21 survey questionnaire was developed by the project team in conjunction with TxDOT, TxDOT ENV, and  
22 FHWA representatives. To determine the extent of potential induced development, regional and local land  
23 use planning authorities were contacted and asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the potential for  
24 the proposed project to induce development. The surveyed experts were also asked to give their opinions  
25 on the percentage of planned growth dependent on the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1, and if  
26 possible, to provide information on the size and location of this growth. The study area for the indirect  
27 impacts questionnaire was the 15-minute travel shed. **Table 8-7** lists the expert panel that returned  
28 responses to the survey.

29



**Table 8-7: Expert Panel Survey Participants**

Name	Agency or Municipality Affiliation
Jeff Taebel	Director, Community and Environmental Planning; H-GAC
Bill Cobabe	City of Mont Belvieu, City Planner
David Draz	City of Dayton, Director of Planning
Don Brandon, P.E.	Chambers County, County Engineer
Harold Cheek	City of Baytown, City Planner

Source: Study Team, 2008

From the analysis of the expert panel survey results, it was determined that areas with the greatest potential for induced development are located at major intersections and adjacent to existing cities. The H-GAC also provided the *Envision Houston Region* report with the survey response.

## 8.5 ADDITIONAL COORDINATION

### 8.5.1 Community Groups

The GPA has coordinated extensively with community groups with an interest in the Grand Parkway project. The GPA accepted all invitations to speak to any group or organization concerning the Grand Parkway project. These community groups were provided a customized presentation that typically included the history of the Grand Parkway project, the general status of all segments of the Grand Parkway, and specific information about their particular area and interests. The presentations lasted approximately 10 to 20 minutes and were followed by a question-and-answer period. Handouts given to the participants included schedules, maps, and contact information. The level of detailed information provided was dependent on the stage of project development. The presentations were updated at the time of each request to reflect the most current information. The GPA and the study team have also been responsive in providing information for public media and community newsletters.

### 8.5.2 Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update and the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as amended, identify the addition of toll facilities, including Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1, as needed to address congestion and growth. The transportation needs identified during the development of the 2035 RTP Update and the 2013-2016 TIP, as amended, are consistent with those found by the Grand Parkway public outreach process. To define regional transportation needs, the H-GAC conducted an extensive public involvement program to gather input from citizens, neighborhood and

1 business groups, governmental bodies, and transportation agencies. The Grand Parkway Segments H and  
2 I-1 are included in the 2035 RTP Update and in the 2013-2016 TIP, as amended.

3  
4 **8.5.3 Website**

5 The GPA maintains a website that can be accessed at [www.grandpky.com](http://www.grandpky.com) for the proposed 180+mile  
6 circumferential highway. The website is updated routinely with current news items, segment status  
7 including Segments H and I-1, and project materials. The website also includes a place to register for the  
8 project mailing list and an opportunity for individuals to submit comments via e-mail.

9  
10 The GPA maintains an open-office concept that allows any individual to telephone or drop by the office to  
11 request information on Segments H and I-1. Faxes and e-mails are also used to transmit information. The  
12 GPA routinely meets with anyone at his or her convenience at locations outside of the GPA office to answer  
13 questions, provide maps and detailed information, or to receive information. These contacts have included  
14 the general public, small groups or special interest organizations, agencies, and elected officials.

15  
16 **8.5.4 Section 4(f)/Chapter 26 Public Hearing on the Lake Houston Wilderness  
17 Park De Minimis Impact Determination**

18 A public hearing will be held on December 18, 2013, to discuss the Lake Houston Wilderness Park De  
19 Minimis Section 4(f) determination per requirements of Chapter 26 of the Texas Parks and Wildlife  
20 Department Code. A public hearing summary is included in **Appendix J**.