

CHAPTER 8

Agency and Public Coordination

CHAPTER 8: AGENCY AND PUBLIC COORDINATION TABLE OF CONTENTS

8.1	NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI)	8-1
8.2	PROJECT COORDINATION PLAN	8-1
8.3	SCOPING AND STUDY AREA	8-2
8.3.1	Public Involvement	8-2
8.3.1.1	February – March 2006 Public Scoping Meetings	8-2
8.3.2	Local Official Involvement.....	8-3
8.3.3	Participating Agency Involvement.....	8-5
8.3.3.1	January 2006	8-5
8.3.3.2	February 2006	8-6
8.3.3.3	March 2006	8-6
8.3.3.4	May 2006	8-7
8.4	ALIGNMENT STUDY	8-7
8.4.1	Public Involvement	8-7
8.4.1.1	May 2007 Public Scoping Meetings	8-7
8.4.1.2	DEIS Public Hearing.....	8-9
8.4.2	Local and Elected Officials Involvement	8-9
8.4.2.1	April 2007	8-9
8.4.2.2	May 2007	8-9
8.4.2.3	July 2007	8-10
8.4.3	Participating Agency Involvement.....	8-10
8.4.3.1	April 2007	8-10
8.4.3.2	May 2007	8-11
8.4.3.3	June 2007	8-11
8.4.3.4	July 2007.....	8-11
8.4.3.5	August 2007	8-12
8.4.4	Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Expert Panel Survey	8-12
8.5	ADDITIONAL COORDINATION	8-13
8.5.1	Community Groups.....	8-13
8.5.2	Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	8-14
8.5.3	Website.....	8-14

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.....	8-9
Table 8-4:	July 18, 2007 Meeting Attendees	8-10
Table 8-5:	April 18, 2007 Meeting Attendees.....	8-11
Table 8-6:	July 16, 2007 Meeting Attendees	8-12
Table 8-7:	Expert Panel Survey Participants	8-13

CHAPTER 8

AGENCY AND PUBLIC COORDINATION

FHWA, TxDOT, and GPA have engaged governmental agencies and the public in an extensive coordination effort to inform others of progress in the planning process and solicit input from them. The Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 project has been open to comments by any person and to all views on the scope of the proposed project, alternatives development, environmental impacts, and any other matter concerning the proposed project. FHWA, TxDOT, and the GPA have considered all comments to date and would continue to consider all comments in its planning process into the future.

The study team documented the public coordination process in the Official Public Meeting Summary Reports for each of the two series of Public Scoping Meetings. General summaries of the Public Scoping Meetings that were held in February-March 2006 and May 2007 are included in **Appendix C (Public Involvement)**.

8.1 NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI)

TxDOT and FHWA filed a NOI to prepare and consider an EIS for Segments H and I-1 of the Grand Parkway on February 17, 2006. The NOI was published in the Federal Register on February 10, 2006 and in the Texas Register on February 3, 2006. Notification to the public was published in the *Houston Chronicle* on February 17, 2006. A copy of the NOI is included in **Appendix A (Notice of Intent)**.

8.2 PROJECT COORDINATION PLAN

TxDOT and the GPA in coordination with FHWA, the lead federal agency, prepared a Project Coordination Plan to facilitate and document the lead agencies' structured interaction with the public and other agencies and to inform the public and other agencies of how the coordination would be accomplished. The Project Coordination Plan outlines how the lead agencies have divided the responsibilities for compliance with the various aspects of the environmental review process, such as the issuance of invitations to participating agencies, and how the lead agencies would provide opportunities for input from the public and other agencies, in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies. The Project Coordination Plan was prepared to meet the requirements of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), Title VI, Section 6002, and was formally approved by FHWA on April 13, 2007.

The Project Coordination Plan identifies which participating/cooperating agencies were included for the proposed project and their respective roles and responsibilities. Participating/cooperating agencies consist of federal and state resource agencies and local agencies with a special interest in the proposed project. Refer to **Appendix H (Project Coordination Plan)** for a copy of the approved Project Coordination Plan for the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 project. A detailed list of the proposed project's participating and cooperating agencies is included in the Project Coordination Plan.

8.3 SCOPING AND STUDY AREA

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

8.3.1 Public Involvement

8.3.1.1 February – March 2006 Public Scoping Meetings

The public was directly involved in the development of a study area for the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1. A series of Public Scoping Meetings were held within the study area at Wilson Junior High School in Dayton, Texas on February 28, 2006 and at Barbers Hill High School in Mont Belvieu, Texas on March 1, 2006. A general meeting summary of this meeting series was prepared and is in **Appendix C (Public Involvement)**.

Public meeting legal notices were printed in English in *The Houston Chronicle*, *the Conroe Courier*, *The Liberty Vindicator*, and *The Baytown Sun* approximately 30 and 10 days prior to the event. The legal notice was also published in Spanish in *The Houston Chronicle's* Neighborhood News Zone 3. Public meeting announcements were also mailed to approximately 1,000 people two weeks prior to the meetings. The mailing list was comprised of property owners, individuals, businesses, and civic and neighborhood organizations within the study area, along with government officials, media, and other stakeholders. TxDOT mailed public meeting notices with informational packets to elected officials approximately 35 days

prior to the public meetings. Press releases were sent to local news media approximately one week prior to the meetings.

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

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

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

8.3.2 Local Official Involvement

One-on-one meetings were held with area elected officials to discuss the project’s need and purpose, constraints in the study area, process, public involvement plan, and schedule. All of the elected officials were supportive of the proposed project and were pleased to see it moving forward. Specific issues from these meetings were used in combination with public and resource agency comments to develop reasonable alternatives for Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1. **Table 8-1** below provides meeting dates, a list of attendees, their comments and concerns, and their affiliations.

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

Affiliation	Attendees	Comment/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. CR 615 @ FM 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 1/2 mile. Development is occurring along 3360 and SH 565.	February 14, 2006
Montgomery County Precinct 4	Mark Bosma; Mike Beitler; and Mark Mooney, County Engineer	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	Wants the facility if it provides a benefit 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). 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 N. Main. Banana Bend Beach Park need to add on constraint, Cemetery at the Lynchburg Ferry area. New high school at N. Main and Wallisville Rd. Need to visit with Goose Creek, Channel View and Sheldon 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	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 US 59, 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 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 is for sale asking \$35 million.	June 1, 2006

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

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 project’s need and purpose, 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 ENV, GPA, and the consulting engineer team serve on a streamlining team known as the FAST to assist in streamlining and expediting the project. The FAST provided guidance throughout the NEPA process and assisted in preparation and review of documentation. The FAST participated in periodic meetings to review decisions made, provide comments on materials, methodologies, criteria, and provided comments on the administrative record. The team members that comprise the FAST are listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix H**).

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

Date	Location	Attendees
January 24, 2006	H-GAC Office	H-GAC and Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA)
February 15, 2006	TxDOT Beaumont Office	TxDOT Beaumont, HNTB, WSA
February 22, 2006	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston	USACE, EPA, USFWS, TPWD, TCEQ, TxDOT, HNTB
March 2, 2006	Hermann Park Clubhouse	TPWD, City of Houston, HNTB
March 7, 2006	H-GAC Office	H-GAC, TxDOT- ENV, FHWA, GPA, HNTB, WSA
March 16, 2006	Dayton High School Cafeteria TCEQ public meeting	WSA, TCEQ, and Public
May 2, 2006	TxDOT Houston District	FAST (TxDOT Houston, TxDOT Beaumont, TxDOT-ENV, FHWA, GPA, HNTB, WSA
May 3, 2006	US Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston	TxDOT Houston, TxDOT Beaumont, TPWD, TCEQ, USFWS, EPA, GLO, USACE, HNTB, WSA

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

8.3.3.1 January 2006

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

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

8.3.3.2 February 2006

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

On February 22, 2006, a USACE Joint Evaluation Meeting was held. The agencies present were the USFWS, TPWD, TCEQ, EPA (by phone), and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Principal issues of concern included the avoidance of impacts to previous mitigation sites; pristine waters; ecologically sensitive streams; and endangered species such as the bald eagle, osprey, red-cockaded woodpecker, and Texas prairie dawn.

8.3.3.3 March 2006

On March 2, 2006, a meeting was held to discuss the status of the Lake Houston State Park transfer from TPWD to the City of Houston. Representatives from the City of Houston Parks and Recreation Department and TPWD were present. To provide better access to the park, TPWD would be agreeable to allowing the use of land in the northern portion of the park for an alignment that would follow on or near existing FM 1485. This action would require the preparation of a Section 4(f) statement.

On March 7, 2006, a meeting was held with H-GAC to discuss traffic and air modeling issues in order to develop consistent horizon years for the preparation of the DEIS. The group jointly decided to use years 2019 (ETC) and 2039 (ETC + 20 yrs) for the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 project traffic, air, and noise modeling. It was agreed that these would be the horizon years, based on 2025 demographics in the current plan and that these years have already been modeled and data is available under the current model.

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

8.3.3.4 May 2006

A FAST meeting was held on May 2, 2006 at the TxDOT Houston District Office to gather input on the Preliminary Alternatives and the technical methodology for the alternatives analysis. Items discussed included the beginning and end points for the alternatives and constraints mapping. Input from FHWA during the meeting indicated the need to keep an alternative end point west of Mont Belvieu along IH 10.

On May 3, 2006, a joint evaluation meeting was held to discuss the preliminary alternatives development process and technical methodology. Various resource agencies were present, including EPA, TCEQ, USACE, USFWS, TPWD, and the General Land Office (GLO). Principal issues discussed included various environmental issues such as endangered species, floodplain crossings, and mitigation sites. All agencies present indicated that the alternatives development process was satisfactory.

8.4 ALIGNMENT STUDY

Alternative alignments were developed within the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 selected corridor to fulfill the need for and purpose of the project and minimize potential environmental impacts. The corridor-level data, supplemented with field-collected data, was used as a guide to determine the alignments that provide the best opportunity to avoid and minimize adverse environmental effects. The following section summarizes outreach efforts conducted during the alignment study phase.

8.4.1 Public Involvement

8.4.1.1 May 2007 Public Scoping Meetings

The public was invited to participate in the alignment study through the Second Series of Public Scoping Meetings that were held within the study area at New Caney High School, in Porter, Texas, on May 8, 2007 and at Eagle Pointe Recreation Complex in Mont Belvieu, Texas, on May 9, 2007.

Public meeting legal notices were printed in English in *The Houston Chronicle*, *the Conroe Courier*, *The Liberty Vindicator*, and *The Baytown Sun* approximately 30 and 10 days prior to the event. Additionally, display ads were placed in community newspapers, the *East Montgomery County Observer*, *Humble/Kingwood/Atascocita Observer*, and in *The Houston Chronicle's* Spanish language publication *La Voz de Houston*. Public meeting announcements were also mailed to approximately 1,300 people two weeks prior to the meetings. The mailing list was comprised of property owners, individuals, businesses,

and civic and neighborhood organizations within the study area, along with government officials, media, and other stakeholders. TxDOT mailed public meeting notices with informational packets to elected officials approximately 35 days prior to the public meetings. Press releases were sent to local news media approximately three weeks prior to the meetings. The GPA and TxDOT websites were also updated with the meeting information.

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

The total number of preliminary alternatives shown included five alternatives in Section A, eight alternatives in Section B, and seven alternatives in Section C. A color map of the study area and these alternatives accompanied the comment form given to attendees. In addition, the preliminary alternatives that were selected as recommended reasonable alternatives included three alternatives in Section A, five alternatives in Section B, and six alternatives in Section C (**Exhibit 2-4: Preliminary Alternatives With Recommended Reasonable Alternatives**). Project documents including the Project Coordination Plan, need and purpose, and first series public scoping meeting record were available for review. TxDOT, GPA, and consultant team representatives were available to answer questions and discuss concerns. Attendees were encouraged to fill out comment forms and submit them at the meeting or to the GPA by mail. A total of 72 comments were received; 55 at the meetings and 17 via mail and e-mail.

Only two respondents commented on the No-Build Alternative, one citing a positive opinion and the other expressing no opinion. In Section A, the majority of respondents indicated that these alternatives did not concern them or they had no opinion. Alternatives A-2, A-4, and A-5 received the most positive feedback. In Section B, Alternatives B-1, B-2 and B-3 received the most positive feedback. In Section C, Alternatives C-2, C-3, and C-6 received the most positive feedback. A general summary of the May 8-9, 2007, Second Series of Public Scoping Meetings is located in **Appendix C (Public Involvement)**.

8.4.1.2 DEIS Public Hearing

The Public Hearing on the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 DEIS is anticipated for the second quarter of 2011, pending the approval and release of the DEIS document. The DEIS document would be posted for public review at multiple locations within the study area at least 45 days prior to the Public Hearing. Legal notices for the Public Hearing would be published in English and in Spanish 30 and 10 days prior to the hearing, in newspapers having a general and local area circulation. Verbal comments would be recorded at the Public Hearing and written comments would be encouraged and accepted at the meeting and via mail or e-mail until 10 days following the meeting. Comments received on the DEIS would be considered in the selection of the preferred alternative.

8.4.2 Local and Elected Officials Involvement

8.4.2.1 April 2007

Letters were sent to all of the elected officials listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix H**) 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 for the second series of public scoping meetings for Segments H and I-1. Elected officials 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, 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 form handouts were given 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 motion was made and

seconded to adopt a resolution that states that the City of Dayton recommends the preliminary alignment B-1 for the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1.

8.4.2.3 July 2007

Letters were sent to all of the elected officials listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix H**) 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 second series of public scoping meetings, draft reasonable alternatives, and alternative analysis methodology. Elected officials 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 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 in order to address specific concerns and to provide updates on the study process. The participating agencies consisted of resource agencies and local agencies with a special interest in the proposed project. Summaries of the meetings are listed below.

8.4.3.1 April 2007

Letters were sent to all of the Participating Agencies listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix H**) 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
National Marine Fisheries Service	Rusty Swafford
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Amy Hanna
US Army Corps of Engineers	John Machol
U.S. EPA Region 6	Michael Jansky

Source: Agency Sign-in, April 2007.

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

8.4.3.2 May 2007

On May 21, 2007, the TCEQ Project Manager of the Cox Road Dump Site was contacted by phone to discuss the potential impact of the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 preliminary alternatives to the hazardous material site. TCEQ advised that a one-half mile avoidance buffer around the contaminated site would be a comfortable distance away from the site for the reasonable alternative alignments.

8.4.3.3 June 2007

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

8.4.3.4 July 2007

Letters were sent to all of the Participating Agencies listed in the Project Coordination Plan (**Appendix H**) inviting them to a coordination meeting held on July 16, 2007 at the GPA Office. The Participating Agencies were given an opportunity to review and discuss the draft reasonable alternatives, alternative analysis technical methodology, and input gathered from the May 8-9, 2007 Second Series of Public Scoping Meetings. Agency attendees and their affiliations are listed in **Table 8-6**.

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 Erling

Source: Agency Sign-in, July 2007.

8.4.3.5 August 2007

Coordination letters were sent on August 3, 2007 to the participating agencies that were unable to attend the July 16, 2007 meeting, including the TPWD, USACE, and the EPA, to update them on the material that was presented. The coordination letters included the presentation materials and maps from the participating agency meeting, and requested their input on the material.

The project team historians met with TxDOT ENV on August 10, 2006 to discuss the findings of the preliminary historic resources survey. Items discussed included the historic resources identified within the study area and the approach and methodology of the survey. TxDOT ENV indicated that they would accept the agreed upon approach of conducting a windshield survey for the reasonable alternatives and that a full reconnaissance survey would be performed for the Preferred Alternative.

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

8.4.4 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Expert Panel Survey

In late 2008 and early 2009, formal surveys were sent to the original stakeholders queried during 2007 and early 2008, and additional planning experts identified in the winter of 2008-2009. The expert panel survey questionnaire was developed by the project team, in conjunction with TxDOT, TxDOT-ENV, and FHWA representatives. To determine the extent of potential induced development, regional, city and county land

use planning authorities were contacted and asked to fill out a questionnaire regarding the potential for the proposed project to induce development. The surveyed experts were also asked to give their opinions on the percentage of planned growth dependent on the Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1, and if possible, provide information on the size and location of this growth. The study area for the indirect impacts questionnaire was the 15-minute travel shed. **Table 8-7** lists the expert panel that returned responses to the survey.

Table 8-7: Expert Panel Survey Participants

Name	Agency or Municipality Affiliation
Jeff Taebel	Director, Community and Environmental Planning; Houston-Galveston Area Council (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. H-GAC also provided the *Envision Houston Region* report with the survey response.

8.5 ADDITIONAL COORDINATION

8.5.1 Community Groups

GPA has coordinated extensively with community groups with an interest in the Grand Parkway project. 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 then 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 dependant on which stage the process was currently undergoing. The presentations were updated at the time of each request to reflect the most current information. GPA and the study team have also been responsive in providing information for other public media and community newsletters.

8.5.2 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The 2035 RTP and the 2008-2011 TIP 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 and the 2008-2011 TIPs are consistent with those found by the Grand Parkway public outreach process. To define regional transportation needs, H-GAC conducted an extensive public involvement program to gather input from citizens, neighborhood and business groups, governmental bodies, and transportation agencies. The Grand Parkway Segments H and I-1 are included in the 2035 RTP and in the 2008-2011 TIP.

8.5.3 Website

GPA has a website at www.grandpky.com for the proposed 180+ mile circumferential highway. The website is updated routinely with current news items, segment process including Segments H and I-1, and project materials. The website also includes a place to register for the project mailing list, and an opportunity for individuals to submit comments via e-mail.

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