## Section 2: Public Meeting Comments and Responses

### *Summary of Comments*

Over 500 comments were received from Public Meeting 4. Copies of the comments are included in Appendix H, and have been grouped together based on the type of comment received – emailed, mailed, submitted to the project website, or comment forms submitted at the public meeting. The comments in Appendix H are presented in numerical order for each of the four comment groups, and the assigned numbering is a continuation of the numbering from Public Meeting 3. A Comment Index at the beginning of Appendix H lists the commenters' names in alphabetical order and identifies each comment by its unique Comment Code.

TxDOT and project team members reviewed all of the comments and sorted the concerns, questions, and suggestions associated with the comments into numbered categories, listed below in the Comment Categories subsection. Responses were developed by TxDOT and the project team to address the issues identified in the comment categories. The responses are presented in the Responses to Comments subsection, with an accompanying table that lists the names of the commenters and related response numbers.

Specific issues and questions about the alternatives and project design identified in the comments are being evaluated by TxDOT and the project team, and will continue to be considered during the project development process. At this stage of the alternatives evaluation process, a response to each comment and question cannot be provided, as many details about the project are not known. More detailed information about the alternatives will be developed as the study proceeds.

A tally of support for the project is summarized below based on information provided on Public Meeting 4 comment forms submitted at the public meeting, submitted by mail, or emailed to TxDOT:

Support the Project ..... 39
Do not support the Project ..... 28
Undecided ..... 18
Blank ..... 5

### *Comment Categories*

1. Developing and evaluating alternatives
2. Cost of the project
3. Considering other modes of transportation as alternatives
4. Increases in congestion in the inner city and related impacts
5. Impacts to neighborhoods and quality of life

6. Impacts to neighborhoods and homes from expanding right-of-way
7. Impacts to businesses and employment
8. Noise and vibration
9. Air quality and health protection
10. Flooding and drainage
11. Tolling and Managed eXpress (MaX) lanes
12. Pedestrian safety and lighting
13. Visual impacts
14. Parks and recreation
15. Trash and debris impact to bayous
16. Property values and property acquisition
17. Aesthetics and landscaping
18. Access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit riders
19. Encouraging single-passenger vehicle use
20. Project benefits to suburban areas while adversely affecting City of Houston residents
21. Project encouraging suburban growth
22. Connect Hardy Toll Road to downtown Houston
23. Conservation of natural resources
24. Impacts to historic resources – neighborhoods, districts, and buildings
25. Impacts to Tribal residents in the downtown area
26. Rejoining/connecting neighborhoods and connecting to downtown
27. Impacts to revitalization and redevelopment investments of neighborhoods
28. Ways to improve public outreach
29. Use of the Pierce Elevated
30. Impacts to farmlands
31. Receipt of project information
32. Construction duration and temporary construction impacts
33. Changes in access (ramping) to/from highways
34. Building the roadway below grade if a tunnel is not possible
35. Elevate the roadway to prevent right-of-way requirements
36. Do not widen the roadway
37. Build a tunnel
38. Roadway capacity
39. Local circulation and access
40. Public input not being incorporated into alternatives development
41. Using Hardy Toll Road rather than I-45
42. Freeway to freeway access (direct connectors)
43. Greenspace caps over the freeways
44. Highway Alignment
45. City of Houston comments
46. METRO comments
47. General comments

## *Responses to Comments*

All comments received are being considered as TxDOT and the project team develop and evaluate roadway alternatives for this project.

1. **Response to comments about the process of developing and evaluating alternatives for the proposed North Houston Highway Improvement Project (NHHIP), and the design alternatives for Segments 1, 2, and 3**

   The NHHIP involves evaluation of Interstate Highway 45 (I-45) North from the United States Highway (US) 59/I-69/State Highway (SH) 288 interchange to Beltway 8 North, the Hardy Toll Road from I-610 North Loop to Beltway 8 North, and portions of I-10 and US 59/I-69 near downtown Houston.

   The previous North-Hardy Planning Studies, in which the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County (METRO) participated with TxDOT and the Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC), considered alternative transportation modes, and identified a regional transit system plan that included commuter rail. METRO has implemented a transit plan, including light rail. The Gulf Coast Rail District is studying other regional commuter rail alternatives. Please refer to **Response 3** for more information on other non-highway modes of transportation, including rail and transit. The project team considers ongoing planning and implementation of other local and regional mobility improvements (roadway, rail, transit) in the planning of the proposed NHHIP.

   The highway component recommendation from the North-Hardy Planning Studies was to add 4 managed lanes to the I-45/Hardy Toll Road corridor from downtown Houston to Beltway 8 North (North-Hardy Planning Studies, Alternatives Analysis Report (Highway Component), 2005).

   During the approval process for the final North-Hardy Planning Studies report for the highway component, TxDOT agreed to the following goals for this phase of project planning.

   - Stay within the existing I-45 right-of-way between Quitman Street and Cavalcade Street, except at intersections where turn lanes may be needed.
   - Minimize adverse effects on quality of life issues of the residents and neighborhoods in the project area.
   - Study Hardy Toll Road as an alternative route for additional lanes.
   - Evaluate the use of tunnels as an alternative in areas of constrained right-of-way.

   The project team considered traffic projections and regional roadway planning, information on environmental constraints, and input from the public and agencies to develop a “universe of alternatives” that meet the highway transportation needs in the study corridor. The “universe of alternatives” was developed from previously identified

alternatives that were presented in the *North-Hardy Planning Studies Alternatives Analysis Report (Highway Component),* and alternatives developed by the project engineering team. The preliminary alternatives were roadway transportation alternatives including at-grade, elevated, and tunnel design options. Interchanges, access ramps, frontage roads, access to adjacent properties, and other design considerations were not evaluated in detail. These alternatives were presented to agencies and the public for comment in October 2012. Traffic data from 2012 was used to screen the project alternatives, which was more recent data than presented in the project Purpose and Need Statement.

The project team then narrowed the focus of study from the "universe of alternatives" to a range of alternatives for more detailed study. The range of alternatives, identified as the preliminary alternatives, includes a "No Action," or No Build alternative. These preliminary alternatives and the results of the alternatives evaluations were presented to agencies and the public for comment in November 2013. Public and agency input, and the project team's evaluations of engineering, traffic, and environmental criteria, were used to review and revise the alternatives.

The preliminary alternatives were evaluated further and narrowed to three reasonable alternatives, from which a proposed recommended alternative was identified. The three reasonable alternatives, which included the proposed recommended alternative, were presented to agencies and the public for comment in April 2015. The next step in the project development process will be to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) analyzing the three reasonable alternatives and the No Build alternative.

TxDOT and the study team have developed alternatives (the universe, preliminary, reasonable, and proposed recommended) in consideration of input from other agencies and the public throughout the study process. The team also analyzed and evaluated the alternatives using engineering, traffic, and environmental criteria to determine which alternative would best meet the project's need and purpose.

At this stage of the project development process, the alternatives that have been developed and analyzed are conceptual. Construction cost was not used as an evaluation criterion, as there is insufficient design detail to accurately estimate the cost to construct the individual alternatives. However, a general preliminary estimate is that the proposed project would cost in excess of $6 billion. Funding sources for portions of the project are being identified.

As discussed in the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Plan (ACPIP) for the NHHIP, a DEIS will be prepared for distribution. A public hearing will be held after distribution of the DEIS. TxDOT will continue conducting meetings, as needed, with cooperating and participating agencies. The project team will also meet with elected

officials, resource agencies, neighborhood groups, and other interested groups and individuals, as needed or as requested, to discuss the alternatives and evaluation criteria. A final decision on the proposed project will not be made by TxDOT until after agencies and the public have the opportunity to comment on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The ACPIP includes a proposed schedule for planned meetings and project milestones, and describes the study process and agency and public review in detail. It is not expected that the EIS process would be complete before 2017. Final design would not be completed until after the EIS study process is concluded.

Specific comments and questions about the three reasonable alternatives, the proposed recommended alternative, and project design have been reviewed by the project team and are being considered to continue to develop alternatives and assess project impacts. Evaluations will continue during the project development process. At this stage of the alternatives evaluation process, a response to each comment and question cannot be provided, as many details about the project are not known. More detailed information about the alternatives and the proposed recommended alternative is being developed as the study proceeds.

## 2. Response to comments about the cost of the project

A general preliminary estimate is that the construction cost for the proposed project would exceed $6 billion. At this stage of project development, the project alternatives are conceptual, including the proposed recommended alternative; therefore, there is insufficient design detail to accurately estimate construction costs. Potential project cost was not a consideration or screening factor for evaluation of the three reasonable alternatives to identify the proposed recommended alternative.

*The North-Hardy Planning Studies Alternatives Analysis Report (Highway Component)* documents the analysis of highway alternatives evaluated for the North-Hardy study corridor. In the study, Conceptual Capital Cost was one factor examined in the analysis of the “short list” of six build alternatives. Other factors were: Mobility Improvements/Demand Potential, Regional Connectivity, Ease of Implementation, Environmental Impacts, and Community Impacts. With the exception of cost, similar evaluation factors and additional criteria were used to evaluate and compare alternatives for the proposed NHHIP. Traffic mobility impacts of the three reasonable alternatives were evaluated. Reduced travel times can reduce travel costs, and for roadways with thousands of trips per day, the cumulative cost savings can be substantial.

Some specific comments are:

- Costs associated with integrating the existing METRO rail lines with the project should be borne by the highway project
  - Response: The proposed recommended alternative presented at Public Meeting 4 would not directly impact existing or proposed METRO rail lines. TxDOT will work with METRO to address any indirect impacts identified by METRO.
- Compare cost of this project with transit development, walking, complete streets, smart growth, and biking
  - Response: As noted in **Response 1**, this project is a highway improvement project. Other modes of transportation have been evaluated in previous studies and are currently being implemented by others. In addition to providing capacity and mobility enhancements, the proposed improvements along I-45 are necessary to improve safety and to upgrade a deteriorating facility.
- Compare cost of impacts of congestion and miles traveled to subsidized single occupancy vehicle travel
  - Response: In the downtown area of Houston, the proposed recommended alternative would increase travel speeds by over 20 miles per hour (mph) on the highway. This increase in travel speed would reduce travel time for the average traveler and reduce congestion (see **Response 9**).

**3. Response to comments about considering other modes of transportation (rail, transit) as alternatives for the proposed NHHIP or in conjunction with project plans**

METRO, TxDOT, and the H-GAC participated in the North-Hardy Planning Studies, during which a variety of modal choices were considered. Modes of transportation addressed in the North-Hardy Planning Studies included transit (bus and rail) and highway. The studies identified a need for alternative transportation modes in the north Houston corridor. METRO is implementing the transit plan in the corridor, including light rail projects. The Gulf Coast Rail District and TxDOT Rail Division are studying other regional commuter rail alternatives. As a cooperating agency, METRO is aware of the NHHIP and will coordinate with TxDOT to determine how it would integrate with other METRO programs, such as bus transit and park-and-ride plans. The NHHIP is proposed to implement highway improvements in the area of the North-Hardy corridor from downtown Houston to Beltway 8 North.

<u>Summary of North-Hardy Planning Studies</u>

The North-Hardy Planning Studies evaluated transit and highway improvement alternatives for a corridor from downtown Houston to 30 miles north, principally in the area between I-45 and the Hardy Toll Road, including Bush Intercontinental Airport

(IAH) and segments of I-45 and US 59/I-69 south of downtown. Study results were documented in the three reports listed below.

- 2003 North-Hardy Corridor Alternatives Analysis Report: Examined transit and highway alternatives; recommended that transit alternatives be examined prior to detailed evaluation of highway alternatives.
- 2004 North-Hardy Corridor Planning Studies, Alternatives Analysis Report (Transit Component): Findings used to develop a regional Transit System Plan that combines an aggressive bus service program with Advanced High Capacity Transit (light rail). METRO is implementing the transit plan, including light rail.
- 2005 North-Hardy Planning Studies, Alternatives Analysis Report (Highway Component): The Recommended Highway Alternative from downtown Houston to Beltway 8 North was to add four managed lanes to the I-45/Hardy Toll Road corridor.

Some other specific comments are:

- Project should incorporate rail, or retain an easement for a future rail line
  - Response: TxDOT has coordinated with METRO throughout this planning process and will continue to do so as the detailed design phase progresses. METRO will provide TxDOT with the layouts of the locations of future rail line(s) to be considered in the project design.
- Project should provide an opportunity to expand METRO's park-and-ride
  - Response: As noted in **Response 1**, this project is a highway improvement project. Other modes of transportation have been evaluated in previous studies, with the involvement of METRO. TxDOT will consider future locations of METRO's facilities during the detailed design phase. Ultimately, the park-and-ride facilities are METRO's responsibility.
- How will project impact METRO's new bus routes
  - Response: As noted in **Response 1**, this project is a highway improvement project and other modes of transportation have been evaluated in previous studies, with the involvement of METRO. TxDOT will consider METRO's bus routes during the detailed design phase.

**4. Response to comments about possible increases in congestion in the inner city, additional traffic on surface streets and in neighborhoods, and potential impacts to community and public resources caused by congestion or additional neighborhood traffic**

Traffic studies performed for the three reasonable alternatives indicate that the alternatives considered would reduce traffic congestion, as compared to existing conditions. For Segment 3, in the downtown area, the traffic model indicates travel speeds would increase by over 20 mph on the highways composing the downtown

freeway system (I-45, I-10, and US 59/I-69). Additionally, the proposed project is planned to increase safety and facilitate traffic movement during a hurricane evacuation. The conceptual design of the three reasonable alternatives avoids or minimizes potential adverse impacts to community, public, and other sensitive resources by minimizing right-of-way acquisition. TxDOT will identify mitigation measures for unavoidable adverse impacts. Efforts will be made to minimize adverse effects on quality of life issues of the residents and neighborhoods. Detailed traffic analysis studies will be performed in the next phase of planning. The results from these detailed analyses will be used to design at-grade frontage road intersections to enhance and optimize traffic operations.

Some specific comments are:

- Concern about traffic going through the Germantown and Woodland Heights neighborhoods
  - Response: TxDOT has evaluated design changes that will minimize cut-through traffic in these neighborhoods. See **Response 39** for information about the design modifications being evaluated.
- Concern about congestion in downtown Houston during special events
  - Response: TxDOT is working closely with the City of Houston, Houston Downtown Management District (HDMD), Houston First, and the professional sports teams to ensure that the NHHIP improvements provide equal or better access to/from downtown for special events.

## 5. Response to comments about possible adverse impacts to neighborhoods, low-income housing, and quality of life

TxDOT will make every effort to minimize adverse impacts to neighborhoods and associated quality of life issues of the residents of neighborhoods. Potential environmental impacts of the No Build alternative and the three reasonable alternatives, including the proposed recommended alternative, are being evaluated and will be documented in the DEIS that is an integral part of the transportation decision-making process for the project. An important purpose of the EIS process is to identify potential impacts resulting from a proposed project, including beneficial and adverse impacts, and to identify measures that may avoid, minimize, or mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) implementing regulations and related guidance, the EIS will consider various environmental, socioeconomic, and other impacts for each reasonable alternative considered. The analysis of quality of life considerations will include evaluation of existing neighborhood resources (for example, residences, businesses, parks, churches and other places of worship, historic properties, public land, visual/aesthetic characteristics) and the potential impacts of construction, traffic noise, air emissions,

changes in access, right-of-way acquisition, etc. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project will be evaluated.

Potential impacts to low-income and minority populations will be identified in accordance with Executive Order 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 1994. The proposed project will be developed in consideration and support of the fundamental goals of environmental justice:

- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations.
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

## 6. Response to comments about the impact to neighborhoods and homes, due to expanding roadway right-of-way, and requests to widen the east or west side of I-45

Anticipated right-of-way requirements for the three reasonable alternatives, including the proposed recommended alternative, were identified and shown at the public meeting in April 2015. Maps and typical sections are also shown on the project website (www.IH45northandmore.com). For the three study segments, the alternatives that were developed would have varying right-of-way requirements, and a preliminary assessment of environmental impacts was performed. This phase of the project includes preparation of a DEIS, which will include an in-depth evaluation of the potential impacts to neighborhoods and homes.

In accordance with NEPA and FHWA's implementing regulations and related guidance, the DEIS will consider various environmental, socioeconomic, and other impacts for each reasonable alternative considered. The analysis of potential impacts of expanding the roadway right-of-way will include evaluating potential impacts to neighborhoods, homes, businesses, and other land uses. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project will be evaluated.

Refer to **Response 7** for more information on right-of-way expansion.

## 7. Responses to comments about the potential impact to businesses and employment

In accordance with NEPA and FHWA's implementing regulations and related guidance, the DEIS will consider various environmental, socioeconomic, and other impacts for each reasonable alternative considered. The analysis of potential impacts of expanding the roadway right-of-way will include evaluating potential impacts to

businesses, including employment. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project will be evaluated in detail, and will include the evaluation of potential right-of-way requirements, changes in access, traffic impacts, and other factors that could affect businesses.

Anticipated right-of-way requirements for the three reasonable alternatives, including the proposed recommended alternative, were identified and shown at the public meeting in April 2015. Maps and typical sections are also shown on the project website (www.IH45northandmore.com). For the three study segments, the alternatives that were developed have varying right-of-way requirements, and a detailed assessment of the alternatives has not been performed. The next phase of the project will be the preparation of a DEIS that will include a detailed evaluation of potential impacts to businesses.

Specific questions and comments from business owners are considered by the project team, but a response to each individual comment is not provided in this document.

Some specific comments are:

- Concern about impacts to the George R. Brown Convention Center
  - Response: TxDOT is coordinating with representatives of the convention center to identify and evaluate measures to minimize impacts to the operation of the facility.
- Concern about impacts to Northline Commons shopping area
  - Response: TxDOT has revised the design to minimize impacts to the Northline Commons shopping area.
- Concern about impacts to Hardy Yards development
  - Response: The proposed recommended alternative would have no direct impacts to this planned development.

Refer to **Response 6** for more information about right-of-way expansion.

## 8. Response to comments about noise and vibration

Traffic noise impacts will be evaluated during the EIS process in accordance with federal regulations. NEPA provides broad authority and responsibility for evaluating and mitigating adverse environmental effects, including roadway traffic noise. The federal legislation that specifically involves abatement of roadway traffic noise is the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970. This law mandates FHWA to develop noise standards for mitigating roadway traffic noise and requires promulgation of traffic noise-level criteria for various land use activities. FHWA's Noise Standard is documented at 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 772. TxDOT developed guidelines for analysis and abatement of roadway traffic noise for federal projects authorized under

23 United States Code (USC). The guidance was reviewed and approved by FHWA. Analysis of traffic noise impacts and noise abatement measures will be performed as part of the EIS for the NHHIP.

TxDOT is not required to assess the impact of operational traffic-induced vibrations. FHWA determined in 2005 that most studies have shown that both measured and predicted vibration levels are less than any known criteria for structural damage to buildings.

Some specific comments on noise are:

- Construct noise barriers prior to roadway construction
  - Response: A noise analysis will be performed for the project. Noise barriers will be considered for qualifying areas. The timing of noise barrier construction (prior to or during roadway construction) would be at the discretion of the contractor.
- Reduce noise levels with landscaping
  - Response: Project funding will include allowances for landscaping.

## 9. Response to comments about air quality, air pollution and emissions, and health protection

Air quality impacts will be evaluated and documented in the EIS in accordance with applicable air quality regulations and guidance. Because the project is in an area that does not attain the ozone standard, it must conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) to achieve national ambient air quality standards. The proposed project must be consistent with the area's financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), currently the 2040 RTP. The RTP and the first four years of roadway projects, called the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), for the Houston-Galveston region must be determined to be conforming to the region's motor vehicle emissions budget set by the state.

The air quality analysis conducted for the EIS will address ozone, carbon monoxide (CO) and Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs). Carbon dioxide is recognized as a naturally-occurring greenhouse gas. It has been classified as a pollutant by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, but is not currently regulated under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

## 10. Response to comments about flooding and drainage

Drainage and flooding are important considerations that are assessed during the project development process. The proposed project would be designed to not adversely impact base flooding elevations to a level that would violate applicable

floodplain regulations and ordinances. Proposed roadway drainage facilities would permit conveyance of the 100-year flood without causing major impacts to the main lanes of the proposed roadways, streams, or adjacent properties. Fill placement in the floodplain would be mitigated with equivalent floodplain storage in the vicinity of the proposed project. Depressed sections of the proposed project will be designed to provide a 100-year level of protection, meaning the travel lanes will be passable for storm events up to and including an event that has the probability of occurring once every one hundred years. This will be achieved through a pumped drainage system that will collect rainwater falling inside the depressed sections and discharge it to an adjacent detention basin or receiving channel. In addition, the entrance points to the depressed sections will be constructed above the adjacent 500-year water surface elevation, such that adjacent floodwaters cannot enter and flood the depressed sections. During final design, final drainage and mitigation analyses will be performed, and will be reviewed by regulatory agencies to confirm that adequate measures have been incorporated into the design to ensure that floodplain encroachment does not increase the risk of flooding to adjacent properties. Addressing current flooding is not a focal point of this project, nor is it an issue under the jurisdiction of TxDOT. The NHHIP will not contribute to additional flooding. Storm water detention ponds may be required as mitigation for storm water flow. TxDOT will consider wet-bottom detention ponds if another local agency will maintain them.

## 11. Response to comments about tolling and Managed eXpress (MaX) Lanes

Alternatives that satisfy the identified need for and purpose of the project, including managed express (MaX) lane alternatives, have been considered. The primary goal for MaX lanes is to move the maximum number of people at maximum speed, and also to integrate the use of both high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) lanes, which have the potential to be tolled. The proposed recommended alternative maintains the existing access to the HOV lanes in the downtown area via the use of MaX lanes. The Texas transportation system faces increasing travel demand, but is constrained by limited funding sources. Demand on the system is outpacing available revenue, and factors such as inflation, a growing population, an aging infrastructure, and more fuel-efficient vehicles are straining current funding sources to their limits. Tolls are used as an additional source of revenue to fund construction and maintenance of roadways. Existing lanes on I-45 would not be tolled. New lanes on I-45 may be tolled. Hardy Toll Road will continue to be tolled. TxDOT is coordinating with the Harris County Toll Road Authority (HCTRA) during the NHHIP development process.

TxDOT or HCTRA will be responsible for tolling; a decision on this has not yet been made. It is likely that there would be a toll for SOVs, but this has not yet been decided. Adding free HOV access to HCTRA toll roads during rush hour would be decided by HCTRA. The details regarding the usage of the MaX lanes have not been finalized, but

TxDOT anticipates that the proposed NHHIP MaX lanes would accommodate buses and HOV traffic.

Some specific comments on MaX lanes are:

- Connectivity between the I-45 MaX lanes, I-45 general-purpose lanes, and I-610
  - Response: Access points between the I-45 MaX lanes and the I-45 general-purpose lanes will be provided to allow adequate distance to perform necessary lane changes. Specifically, access points from the MaX lanes and general-purpose lanes will be located at an appropriate distance to safely and directly access the I-610 direct connectors.
- Proposed I-10 express lanes reduce from two lanes in each direction to one lane in each direction
  - Response: TxDOT is revising the proposed I-10 express lanes to show the proposed structure of the I-10 express lanes as three lanes in each direction until it would connect to the existing infrastructure near Houston Avenue. The third lane on the I-10 express structure would be for buses only and would begin/terminate at Smith Street/Louisiana Street. Increasing the number of lanes west of Houston Avenue would require additional improvements along I-10, which is beyond the limits of this project.
- Provide connectivity between MaX lanes from the freeway systems
  - Response: Connectivity between systems on the MaX lanes is planned to be provided by: exit the MaX lanes to enter the general-purpose lanes, change freeway systems via the direct connector, and then enter the MaX lanes again.

## 12. Response to comments regarding safety and need for pedestrian-friendly lighting

Requirements for lighting would be addressed during detailed design of the project. TxDOT's Highway Illumination Manual specifies procedures and requirements for the design of continuous and safety lighting systems, as set forth in state regulations.

## 13. Response to comments about visual impacts

TxDOT will make every effort to minimize adverse visual impacts of the proposed project. Potential environmental impacts, including visual impacts, of the alternatives developed will be evaluated in a DEIS that will be an integral part of the transportation decision-making process for the project. An important purpose of the EIS process is to identify potential impacts resulting from a proposed project, including beneficial and adverse visual impacts, and to identify measures that may avoid, minimize, or mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts.

Some specific comments about visual impacts include:

- Concern about parallel freeways and "rubbernecking" – need a barrier between freeways
  - Response: This is a common issue with urban freeways versus the rural freeways that have more separation between the opposing lanes. This is a situation that exists today for almost all freeways in Houston. TxDOT is evaluating using glare screens (e.g., vertical panels along the center barrier) to shield the view of opposing directions. The lengths and locations of screening would be determined during the detailed design phase.
- Greenspace caps over highways would impact the skyline view for drivers driving into downtown Houston
  - Response: Greenspace caps over highways would only be located over a limited length of the roadway. The length of these sections is typically constrained by roadways beginning to elevate from below ground level to a higher elevation section, either at-grade or above ground level.

## 14. Response to comments about impacts to parks and recreation

Based on the preliminary analysis of the three reasonable alternatives, no parks would be directly impacted by the NHHIP. TxDOT will make every effort to minimize adverse impacts to parks and other recreation resources. Potential environmental impacts of the alternatives developed will be evaluated in a DEIS that will be an integral part of the transportation decision-making process for the project. An important purpose of the EIS process is to identify potential impacts resulting from a proposed project, including beneficial and adverse impacts, and to identify measures that may avoid, minimize, or mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts.

Per federal regulations, FHWA and other Department of Transportation (DOT) agencies cannot approve the use of land from publicly-owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or public and private historical sites unless certain conditions apply. FHWA will ensure that the study process complies with the regulations.

Some specific comments about parks include:

- Coordinate with City of Houston Parks Department to create a covered greenspace cap (Segment 2 and Segment 3). Greenspace cap improvements should include connections to East Downtown, Midtown, and Buffalo Bayou.
  - Response: TxDOT is including bridge design elements in the depressed sections of the project that would accommodate a covered greenspace in Segment 2 and on US 59/I-69/I-45 east of the George R. Brown Convention Center in Segment 3. Jurisdiction over the greenspace/park, and funding for the construction and implementation of the greenspace/park would be determined later. See **Response 43**.

- Is there federal money available for building more parks? Use carbon credits or sell right-of-way on TxDOT land.
  - Response: The federal money TxDOT receives for projects is for transportation projects only and cannot be used to build parks. Coordination with the City of Houston Parks and Recreation Department will be addressed in the future if required by the selected alternatives.
- Preserve existing hike and bike facilities, especially along the bayous
  - Response: TxDOT is committed to preserving existing hike and bike facilities as much as possible. In the instance of any modifications to existing facilities, TxDOT will work with the City of Houston, Houston Parks Board, and other necessary agencies and organizations to provide the same level of connectivity as the existing conditions.
- Connect to and consider planned hike and bike facilities, especially along the bayous
  - Response: TxDOT is committed to preserving future planned hike and bike facilities as much as possible. In the instance of any modifications to planned facilities, TxDOT will work with the City of Houston, Houston Parks Board, and other necessary agencies or organizations to provide the same level connectivity as the future planned facilities would provide.
- Add a greenspace section or "capped" section to the sections of US 59/I-69 between SH 288 and I-45 and between Spur 527 and SH 288
  - Response: Additional "capped" sections are not being considered by TxDOT at this time.

15. **Response to comments about mitigation plans for trash and debris from I-45, related to potential impacts to bayous**

TxDOT has developed effective environmental protection measures and best management practices (BMPs) under their Maintenance Program to provide a safe and functional roadway system, ensure clean and aesthetically pleasing highways and facilities, and improve the value and prolong the functional lifespan of TxDOT infrastructure. Regular road inspections and timely debris removal are critical components of TxDOT's Debris and Spills Maintenance Program. Removing litter and debris helps to keep TxDOT's highways clean and aesthetically appealing, as well as keeping roadway drains clear and working properly to prevent flooding. The Drainage Maintenance Program also helps TxDOT protect water resources from impacts by completing necessary ditch, culvert, storm drain, or other drainage repair/cleaning work, thereby allowing the storm drain system to function properly, and reducing sediment and debris traveling to water resources during periods of inclement weather.

During construction, TxDOT requires contractors to use BMPs, including erosion and sediment controls and storm water management controls. The erosion and

sediment controls are measures used to prevent or reduce erosion, and redirect storm water flow during construction/maintenance activities. The storm water management controls are used after construction/maintenance is completed to prevent pollution due to storm water runoff. TxDOT's standard specifications for construction and maintenance of highways, streets, and bridges requires contractors to remove litter, debris, objectionable material, temporary structures, excess materials, and equipment from the work locations following construction.

### 16. Response to comments about impacts to property values and property acquisition

There are many variables that influence property values. A roadway project can affect property values both beneficially and negatively, resulting in increases, decreases, or no changes in value as a result of roadway improvements. The NHHIP is being developed to minimize adverse impacts to residential, commercial, industrial, and other land uses in the project area.

Property acquisition would not occur until the EIS study and engineering design is complete. When property acquisition is required, TxDOT's acquisition and relocation assistance program would provide assistance and counseling to residential property owners that would be required to relocate. The relocation assistance program is conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended; 49 CFR Part 24, Subparts C through F; Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (Federal Fair Housing law); Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Amendment Act of 1974 and TxDOT policies and procedures. Relocation resources would be available, without discrimination, to all affected property owners required to relocate as a result of implementation of a proposed project. No person would be displaced by the NHHIP unless and until adequate replacement housing has been provided or is in place. Replacement housing would be offered to all displaced persons regardless of their race, color, religion, sex, disability, or national origin. Replacement housing would be decent, safe, and sanitary, without causing undue financial hardship. Non-residential property owners, such as businesses, churches, and others would be provided information on adequate replacement locations for their current property and may be reimbursed for costs based on TxDOT policies and procedures.

### 17. Response to comments about aesthetics (impacts to existing trees) and incorporating landscaping into the project, and the request to add greenspace and parks

There are a variety of federal, state, and departmental acts and directives that guide TxDOT activities related to landscaping and aesthetic design and maintenance. While there are numerous citations, the combined impact of these requirements can be summarized as follows:

- The landscape and visual aesthetic qualities of a transportation corridor are an environmental characteristic that, by law, must be considered in the design process and, where possible, enhanced
- Landscape disturbed by construction of a highway must be reestablished for environmental and aesthetic reasons. The re-vegetation process is to be accomplished with appropriate native and adapted species.
- To the extent possible, plants used for re-vegetation of rights-of-way should be low water use (xeric) plant materials
- Where a transportation project must disturb an environmentally sensitive landscape, wetland, historic site, established residential neighborhood, or scenic landscape, appropriate actions must be conducted to mitigate for adverse visual and environmental impacts
- TxDOT recognizes the need for developing highways with acceptable visual quality and has developed several proactive programs that encourage and assist the development of such transportation corridors. These include the Transportation Enhancements Program, Construction Landscape Program, Cost Share Program, the Governors Community Achievement Awards, Green Ribbon Landscape Improvement Program, and Landscape Partnership Program.
- TxDOT recognizes the opportunity to implement "signature" bridges to signify and distinguish various neighborhoods and districts within the study corridor, while improving the visual qualities of the project. The design of bridges would be conducted as a collaboration between the districts or neighborhood groups and TxDOT. Funding for "signature" bridges would be determined in a later phase of project development.

A portion of the construction budget is allocated for landscaping; however, TxDOT does not have authority to build parks. The project would be developed under TxDOT's Green Ribbon Program, which allocates funds for trees and plants within the roadway right-of-way. Any additional greenspace, including parks, would have to be provided by agencies and organizations other than TxDOT.

Refer to **Response 14** for more information regarding the addition of greenspace, landscaping, and parks.

### 18. Response to comments about improving access for pedestrians, cyclists, and/or transit riders, and the request to add bike trails

Bicyclists and pedestrians would not be allowed on the main lanes of I-45, I-10, SH 288 and US 59/I-69. Frontage roads would include wider outside lanes for shared use with bicycles.

In accordance with the federal Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations Regulations and Recommendations by the U.S. Department of

Transportation (March 2010), TxDOT will consider including bicycle and pedestrian accommodations in the proposed project, taking into consideration existing and anticipated bicycle and pedestrian facility systems and needs, and linkages to transit stops and corridors, including the transit (METRO) changes implemented in August 2015.

The addition of bike trails to the project area would need to be addressed by agencies and organizations other than TxDOT. The addition of bike lanes/bike facilities to local streets would be addressed in conjunction with the City of Houston.

Some specific comments about bicycle and pedestrian accommodations include:

- Preserve existing or proposed hike and bike trails along White Oak Bayou; add trail along White Oak Bayou
  - Response: It is expected that the proposed project would bridge White Oak Bayou. The project design will consider existing and proposed hike and bike trails along the bayous and other locations in the project area. There may be temporary impacts to some trails during construction; impacts would be minimized as much as possible. The NHHIP project would not add trails along the bayou.
- Include a shared use path, not a shared motor vehicle and bicycle lane on the frontage roads
  - Response: Comment noted. TxDOT will evaluate this during detailed design.
- Provide crossings for cyclists and pedestrians to connect to Buffalo Bayou
  - Response: Comment noted. TxDOT will evaluate accommodating connections along Buffalo Bayou during detailed design.
- Ensure that surface street bridges accommodate space for pedestrians and bicycles
  - Response: The addition of bike lanes/bike facilities to local streets would be addressed in conjunction with the City of Houston.
- Cyclists cannot share a road over long bridges with vehicles
  - Response: The addition of bike lanes/bike facilities to local streets would be addressed in conjunction with the City of Houston. Cyclists would be able to determine alternate routes to accommodate their needs. See **Response 39** for descriptions of modifications related to local access.
- Accessibility to trails during construction (also under **Response 32**)
  - Response: There may be temporary impacts to some trails during construction; impacts would be minimized as much as possible.
- Add sidewalks and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps
  - Response: TxDOT will include sidewalks along the frontage roads as part of this project, and all intersections will be designed to be ADA compliant, per federal requirements.

- Add pedestrian and bicycle improvements across US 59/I-69/I-45 as per the East Downtown Management District Livable Center Study
    - Response: TxDOT will include sidewalks along the frontage roads as part of this project, and all intersections will be designed to be ADA compliant per federal requirements.

19. **Response to comments about encouraging single-passenger commuter traffic**

As noted in **Response 1**, multi-modal solutions were studied in the North-Hardy Planning Studies to identify the combination of transportation modes that would provide the best improvements to congestion and safety. The identified highway transportation improvements are needed because the existing I-45 corridor currently operates at or near capacity in both peak and off-peak periods. Future transportation demand from projected population and economic growth is expected to place a greater strain on the existing facility.

Managed lanes were selected as the added capacity improvement because they would allow TxDOT and METRO to better manage the flow of traffic along I-45 by allowing single-passenger commuters to access the new capacity lanes to regulate demand, separating the traffic streams to reduce turbulence, and using available and unused capacity.

Please also refer to the Federal Highway Administration Primer on Managed Lanes: http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/managelanes_primer/

20. **Response to comments about the proposed project providing benefit to suburban areas while adversely affecting those who live in the City of Houston**

The NHHIP is being planned to provide benefit to all users of the roadway(s) that TxDOT would propose to improve under this project. Projected increases in population and employment in the Houston region will contribute to additional traffic congestion on I-45, which is currently classified as serious to severe. The existing I-45 facility in the north Houston area currently operates near capacity, resulting in severe congestion during peak and off-peak periods. The proposed project is needed to address the severe congestion and to accommodate existing and anticipated future traffic. Additionally, the project is needed to bring the roadway up to current design standards, which would improve safety and provide for more efficient movement of people and goods. Improved efficiency is also needed to aid in evacuation events. The additional demand will put a strain on the existing facility, which also has design deficiencies in some areas, thereby affecting safety. The purpose of the proposed NHHIP is to create additional roadway capacity to manage congestion, enhance safety, and to improve mobility and operational efficiency.

H-GAC is the region-wide voluntary association of local governments in the 13-county Gulf Coast planning region of Texas. H-GAC has developed forecasts of future development trends and growth patterns in the region, and the effects on traffic volumes for the design year 2040 – as reflected in the long-range plan, the 2040 RTP. The regional traffic model incorporates all of the approved and planned roadway, transit, and other transportation projects that are projected to be needed in the region for the next 20+ years.

## 21. Response to comments about the project encouraging suburban growth

The proposed project is needed to address the severe congestion on the existing I-45 and to accommodate anticipated future highway traffic for the design year 2040. The existing I-45 roadway facility in the north Houston area currently operates near capacity, resulting in congestion during peak and off-peak periods. Additionally, future transportation demand from projected population and economic growth throughout the entire Houston-Galveston region is expected to place a greater strain on the existing facility. The population of the Houston-Galveston region is expected to increase by an estimated 3.7 million people, or 64 percent, between the years 2000 to 2040. Suburban development is likely to continue to grow with or without the proposed project.

## 22. Response to comments about connecting Hardy Toll Road to downtown Houston

The HCTRA system map shows the Hardy Toll Road extension to downtown Houston as a future project. An assumption for the NHHIP study is that the extension is a reasonably foreseeable project, and that it will be operational by the time the NHHIP would be completed. Currently, HCTRA estimates that construction of the extension would begin in 2020, according to HCTRA's court-approved capital plan for the fiscal year period 2015-2020. Current plans from HCTRA for the Hardy Toll Road Extension show that the Toll Road southbound will connect to the US 59/I-69 main lanes and frontage road, and to Elysian Street.

## 23. Response to comments about conservation of natural resources

TxDOT will make every effort to minimize adverse impacts to natural resources. Potential environmental impacts of the alternatives developed will be evaluated in a DEIS that will be an integral part of the transportation decision-making process for the project. An important purpose of the EIS process is to identify potential impacts resulting from a proposed project, including beneficial and adverse impacts, and to identify measures that may avoid, minimize, or mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts. In accordance with NEPA and FHWA's implementing regulations and related guidance, the EIS process will consider the potential impacts to natural resources of the

reasonable alternatives considered. Natural resources to be addressed include wetlands, streams, vegetation, and wildlife.

Coordination regarding potential impacts to regulated resources, such as wetlands and water quality, would be in accordance with regulatory requirements. Permitting would be conducted in coordination with the applicable regulatory agency, and would involve review by other agencies and the public, if required.

### 24. Response to comments about potential impacts to historic resources, including historic neighborhoods, districts, and buildings

Potential environmental impacts to historic resources were considered during the development and analysis of alternatives. During the evaluation of the reasonable alternatives, several historic resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places were identified in the project area. The project team realigned the alternatives to the extent practicable to avoid potential impacts.

Potential effects to historic resources will be evaluated in the DEIS in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) and the Antiquities Code of Texas. In accordance with federal and state regulations, studies will be conducted during the EIS process to identify historic and archeological resources and the potential adverse effects of the proposed project. Every effort will be made to minimize disruption of and to preserve existing historic resources, including potential historic districts, individual buildings/resources, and archeological resources.

### 25. Response to comments about construction impacts to Tribal residents in the downtown area

As part of the environmental impact assessment, which will be documented in the DEIS, the study team will evaluate potential project impacts, including construction impacts, to residents within and along the project study corridor. In addition to review of U.S. Census data to determine the reported number of Native Americans in the study area, TxDOT conducts Tribal consultation and coordination in accordance with the NHPA.

### 26. Response to comments about "rejoining," or connecting, neighborhoods, and connecting to downtown

As alternatives were developed and evaluated, the feasibility of improving connections between neighborhoods was investigated. Throughout the planning process, the project team considered a range of criteria to evaluate the various alternatives; the evaluation criteria are discussed in **Response 1**. Some of the alternatives presented at Public Meeting 4 rejoin or connect neighborhoods. Design modifications for these

alternatives to improve neighborhood connectivity may be considered based on public comments and engineering and environmental feasibility.

The proposed recommended alternative attempts to rejoin or connect neighborhoods in the downtown area. For instance, the removal of the Pierce Elevated would rejoin the west side of downtown to the Midtown area; the addition of depressed freeways on the east side of downtown would open EaDo to downtown.

Some specific comments about neighborhood connectivity include:

- Isolation of Midtown from Hermann Park, museum area, and medical center
  - Response: TxDOT made efforts to maintain the same level of access as existing conditions, to the extent possible. As the design process continues and public comments are addressed in the design of the proposed recommended alternative, it is expected that local access would improve with the proposed project. See **Response 39** for the details on local circulation and access. As supported by the proposed design and H-GAC, local or short trips are intended to be made on the surface street network and longer trips are intended to be made on the freeway system. Connectivity of local streets over US 59/I-69 in Midtown would be provided under the proposed recommended alternative.
- The Near Northside neighborhood has invested funding over the past several years to reconnect with the central business area of Houston. The elevated portion on Segment 3 over the light rail tracks would create a barrier for the Near Northside.
  - Response: I-10 in the area between North Main Street and Walnut Street is currently elevated. The proposed recommended alternative provides generally the same local street connectivity and would accommodate the City of Houston's plan for connecting San Jacinto Street to Fulton Street. With the proposed recommended alternative, North Main Street, Naylor Street/San Jacinto Street, McKee Street, Hardy Road, Elysian Street, and Jensen Drive would have connectivity over the freeways.
- The double freeway (US 59/I-69 and I-45) on the east side of downtown will segregate areas to the east
  - Response: Currently, the freeway in this section is elevated. The proposed recommended alternative would include I-45 and US 59/I-69 as depressed in this section, allowing for the addition of greenspace above portions of the roadways. TxDOT has worked closely with the City of Houston, HDMD, and EaDo to optimize the streets that would remain open.

## 27. Response to comments about project impact to revitalization and redevelopment investments of neighborhoods in the project area

It is TxDOT policy to conduct a thorough and complete Community Impacts Assessment (CIA) to identify and address the community impacts of transportation projects. During the development and screening (evaluation) of alternatives for the proposed project, the goal has been to avoid and minimize impacts to neighborhoods as much as possible. Information about plans for revitalization and redevelopment of neighborhoods is considered during planning. To obtain information about current and future plans, the study team has coordinated, and will continue to coordinate with neighborhood groups, City and county agencies, economic development organizations, and others. In addition, TxDOT reviews and considers all comments and information provided to them during the study process.

## 28. Response to comments regarding ways to improve public outreach

TxDOT considers all suggestions received and continuously implements strategies and methods to improve the dissemination of information to the public.

## 29. Response to comments about keeping, removing, or alternative uses of the Pierce Elevated

If the preferred alternative for the project selected by TxDOT does not include use of the Pierce Elevated, it would not be used by TxDOT as a roadway. Proposed use of the land and/or elevated structure by others would require separate development and funding by others.

## 30. Response to comments about impacts to farmland

As part of the environmental impact study process, the study team is evaluating potential project impacts to farmland. The proposed project would not directly affect farmland. Potential indirect and cumulative impacts that may occur as a result of the proposed project are being evaluated, and the results of the analyses will be included in the DEIS. It is TxDOT policy to comply with the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) in accordance with the Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) policy for implementing the act, and the FHWA policies for coordinating FPPA determinations and for soliciting approval of transportation projects through the NEPA process.

## 31. Response to requests for receipt of project information

Commenters who requested to be included on the project mailing list have been added to the list. Commenters who asked to be kept informed or updated on the

project are being included on project communications. In addition, TxDOT will provide information on the project website (www.IH45northandmore.com) and via the Public Information Office when there is news regarding the NHHIP.

A specific comment about communicating project information is:

- Provide information and notice of public meetings to residents that may live beyond the project area but work within the project area. Need to consider the commuters.
  - Response: Notification of the public meetings includes many outreach methods, including:
    - Public meeting notices are published in the Houston Chronicle and several other newspapers
    - The project website provides updates on public involvement opportunities
    - TxDOT's Public Information Office sends press releases to a variety of media
    - Elected officials are notified by mail
    - Meeting notifications are mailed to persons on the project mailing list, which is continuously updated
  - TxDOT provides project information during the study in many ways:
    - At Transportation Policy Council and Transportation Advisory Council meetings at H-GAC
    - On the project website
    - Presentations at community and professional organization meetings
    - Responding to media requests for information

## 32. Response to comments about construction duration, and temporary impacts of construction

A construction date has not been determined. The environmental review process is expected to last until 2018, including public and agency coordination, development and evaluation of alternatives, preparation of the Draft EIS and Final EIS, and the Record of Decision. The project could not be constructed until after TxDOT has approved the Final EIS and issued a Record of Decision, design plans have been approved, and necessary permits and approvals are obtained. It is not known when construction or property acquisition would begin; it is too early in the process to estimate. Funding sources for portions of the project are being identified, but construction or property acquisition would not occur until completion of the environmental review.

Some specific comments about construction impacts include:

- Duration of construction
  - Response: Construction is anticipated to last between 5 and 10 years.
- Temporary construction impacts to transit, businesses, and residents
  - Response: The project would be designed to minimize temporary impacts to transit, businesses, residents, and others.

## 33. Response to comments about changes in access to and from (entrance and exit ramps) highways as presented at the public meeting

Access, including entrance and exit ramps, between frontage roads/surface streets and highways could be re-evaluated based on public comments; this includes potentially relocating a proposed ramp or potentially adding additional access points. Generally, the alternatives were designed to maintain existing access points, while designing the new roadways to be consistent with current design standards. If the distance between requested access points is adequate, TxDOT will evaluate the requested additional access point (on/off). The design team may consider design modifications at locations where changes in access were made from existing conditions.

Some specific comments on access are:

- The existing northbound exit ramp south of Cavalcade Street has been eliminated
  - Response: TxDOT originally proposed to remove the northbound exit ramp south of Cavalcade Street and replace it with a northbound entrance ramp slightly south of the existing exit ramp location. However, TxDOT has subsequently reversed that decision and proposes to construct a northbound exit ramp south of Cavalcade Street, which would be similar to existing conditions.
- The existing southbound exit ramp at Cavalcade Street has been relocated to north of Link Road, which is a two-lane local street
  - Response: TxDOT has redesigned the southbound Cavalcade Street exit ramp to be elevated adjacent to the I-45 general-purpose lanes and will now pass over Link Road. The ramp will merge with the southbound frontage road south of Link Road.
- The existing I-610 eastbound exit to Irvington Boulevard has been relocated to Fulton Street, west of Irvington Boulevard
  - Response: TxDOT has evaluated various design modifications to shift the location of the proposed eastbound exit ramp at Fulton Street. However, the configuration of the northbound I-45 direct connector to eastbound I-610 would not allow for the eastbound Irvington Boulevard exit ramp to be

located east of Fulton Street, as an undesirable weaving condition would be introduced on eastbound I-610.

- The existing I-45 northbound entrance ramp from Quitman Street has been eliminated
  - Response: TxDOT has evaluated various design options to incorporate the northbound Quitman Street entrance ramp. The design that was determined feasible includes a collector-distributor (C-D) system located adjacent to the northbound general-purpose lanes. This system would connect with the northbound Quitman Street entrance ramp to I-45 and would also serve as a northbound frontage road. The northbound exit to North Main Street would be braided with the Quitman Street entrance ramp.
- Access to SH 288 from the downtown area has been reduced from existing conditions
  - Response: TxDOT has modified the proposed design to provide access to the SH 288 general-purpose lanes and HOV lanes from Chenevert Street. TxDOT has also evaluated design modifications to the Chenevert Street ramps, which would improve local access in that vicinity.
- There appears to be less access from US 59/I-69 southbound to Midtown
  - Response: TxDOT is proposing to depress US 59/I-69 in this area and maximize the number of local cross streets that would remain open. Due to the depressed section of freeway, the number of ramps provided is limited because of the changes in roadway profiles. The existing Webster Street entrance ramp would be maintained, providing access to US 59/I-69 southbound and to Midtown. The existing McGowen Street exit ramp would be relocated to Bell Street.
- Do not close the Hamilton Street exit ramp from US 59/I-69 southbound
  - Response: TxDOT has modified the design to maintain the southbound US 59/I-69 exit to Hamilton Street and the entrance ramp to US 59/I-69 northbound at Chenevert Street. Reconfiguring these access points would allow Hamilton Street traffic to use the existing Hamilton Street.

## 34. Response to request to build the roadway below grade if a tunnel is not possible

Tunnel design options were considered during the development of preliminary project alternatives. The tunnel alternatives did not rank as favorably as the non-tunnel alternatives. As a result, the tunnel alternatives were not included for further evaluation and consideration. Please refer to **Response 1** regarding the alternatives evaluation process, and **Response 37** regarding the evaluation of the tunnel alternatives.

The alternatives presented at the April 2015 public meeting included depressed (or below grade) roadways. Alternative 10 in Segment 2 proposed the I-45 main lanes to

be depressed from just south of Patton Street to south of North Main Street (approx. 2,500 linear feet). Alternative 11 in Segment 3 proposed the US 59/I-69 general-purpose lanes and the I-45 general-purpose lanes to be depressed between Commerce Street and Montrose Boulevard. It should be noted that due to engineering design criteria and other constraints, such as right-of-way, the opportunity to add access points between at-grade frontage roads and depressed general-purpose lanes is limited.

Additional depressed areas in Segment 3 for Alternative 11 were considered but were determined to be infeasible due to engineering and environmental constraints.

### 35. Response to request to elevate the roadway to prevent additional right-of-way requirements

Elevated roads were considered as alternatives but were eliminated due to noise impacts, visual impacts, and other factors.

### 36. Response to request to not widen the roadway

Previous studies identified a need for additional highway capacity in the north Houston corridor, and recommended adding four managed lanes to the I-45/Hardy Toll Road corridor from downtown Houston to Beltway 8 North (North-Hardy Planning Studies, Alternatives Analysis Report [Highway Component], 2005). Refer to Response 1 for more information about the North-Hardy Corridor Studies, prepared by TxDOT, METRO, and H-GAC, that evaluated transportation needs in the corridor and potential highway, transit, and rail improvements.

### 37. Response to request to build a tunnel

Please refer to **Response 1** regarding the evaluation criteria that were used to compare and evaluate the three reasonable alternatives.

Throughout the alternatives development process, the alternatives were assessed and compared to each other to identify the alternatives having desirable characteristics to meet the project's need and purpose. When the tunnel alternatives were compared with other non-tunnel alternatives, the tunnel alternatives did not rank as favorably as the non-tunnel alternatives. The non-favorable rankings were due to limited shoulder widths, lower speed, challenging incident management issues, and the complexity of tunnel construction compared with traditional roadway construction. Additionally, the operational and maintenance requirements for a tunnel were more complex than those for a traditional roadway. As a result, the tunnel alternatives scored as undesirable in one or more of the traffic evaluation criteria when compared to the non-tunnel alternatives. Therefore, the tunnel alternatives were not considered for further

evaluation and analysis. Please note that cost was not a factor, as explained in **Response 1**.

In Segment 2 (I-610 to I-10), the tunnel alternative generally scores well from a traffic perspective if evaluated as a stand-alone section. The tunnel allows for good use of the MaX lanes along I-45, reduces traffic on I-45 from about 10,000 to 33,000 vehicles daily, and reduces the volume to capacity ratio along the I-45 general-purpose lanes up to 14 percent. However, in Segment 3 (I-10 to US 59/ I-69), the tunnel alternatives do not perform as well in the traffic evaluation criteria. One of the tunnel alternatives resulted in increased traffic and travel time on I-45, thereby negatively impacting mobility, compared to the other alternatives. From a traffic perspective, Segments 2 and 3 should be evaluated together since the tunnel would extend in both segments and cannot be terminated at I-10; as a result, both tunnel alternatives scored as undesirable in one or more of the traffic evaluation criteria.

### 38. Response to comments regarding roadway capacity

The H-GAC traffic model shows that two general-purpose lanes in each direction on I-45 will adequately accommodate projected traffic volumes for year 2035, but the study team concurs that adding an additional lane in each direction will provide operational benefits for future users. The number of general-purpose lanes on I-45 will be re-evaluated to maintain at least three lanes in each direction through the limits of the study, where feasible. For the depressed section of Segment 2, TxDOT is evaluating adding additional general-purpose lanes. Additional proposed right-of-way along I-45 will need to be evaluated from North Main Street to I-610 to accommodate the additional general-purpose lanes.

In addition, some comments were related to the capacity of direct connectors, specifically, the following:

- Some of the I-45/I-610 interchange direct connectors reduce from two lanes to one lane, which seems insufficient
  - Response: The direct connectors were designed to provide adequate capacity based on future traffic volumes.

### 39. Response to comments regarding local circulation and access

Local street circulation and access could be re-evaluated based on public comments. Additionally, as the proposed recommended alternatives for each study segment are further refined in the design process, the design team will be enhancing the local street components of the plan, including determining individual intersection design and geometry. Efforts were made to match the level of access and connectivity on the local street network to existing conditions. In some cases, local street connectivity

would be constrained by roadway profiles or other engineering constraints. During the upcoming design phases, TxDOT will be coordinating with the City of Houston, and other agencies and organizations as necessary, to determine roadway typical sections based on roadway classification and connectivity of the local street network. TxDOT will coordinate with the City of Houston to accommodate future City projects. See Response 18 for information about pedestrian and bicycle access on the local street network.

Some specific comments on local circulation and access are:

- Maintain two-way traffic on North Main Street until the intersection with Houston Avenue
  - Response: TxDOT has evaluated various options to maintain two-way traffic while improving the safety of the southbound I-45 entrance ramp interaction with Houston Avenue. The proposed design would include modifications to maintain two-way traffic on Houston Avenue while providing access to southbound I-45.
- Remove or keep the North Street Bridge
  - Response: The design team is considering removing the North Street bridge to accommodate proposed roadway profiles to clear the floodplain in the vicinity of the Little White Oak Bayou crossing.
- Extend Melbourne Street to northbound I-45 frontage road
  - Response: The design team will consider connecting Melbourne Street to the proposed northbound I-45 frontage road.
- Maintain connectivity of West Dallas Street under the Downtown Connector
  - Response: TxDOT is evaluating potential design revisions in this area to allow for the Dallas Street connectivity to downtown.
- Northside access
  - Response: TxDOT will evaluate the opportunity to provide for a grade-separated future connection of San Jacinto Street to Fulton Street, which is a future proposed project by the City of Houston. Crossings will be at North Main Street and at Elysian Street, which is consistent with existing conditions.
- Maintain connectivity of Polk Street over the depressed freeways
  - Response: TxDOT has worked closely with the City of Houston, HDMD, and EaDo to optimize the streets that would remain open. TxDOT will continue to evaluate keeping Polk Street open, since there are design constraints related to the need to elevate I-45 out of the depressed section in this area to connect with the existing southbound I-45. Additionally, bicycle and pedestrian facilities will continue to be considered for this crossing. See **Response 18**.
- Maintain connectivity of Runnels Street

- Response: TxDOT evaluated maintaining the connectivity of Runnels Street, but due to the various elevations of the I-45 and US 59/I-69 travel lanes and the various direct connectors, the structure would have been required to span the freeway section, either over or under, which would not be feasible. Navigation Boulevard would provide the necessary, adjacent connectivity between I-45 and US 59/I-69.

- Maintain existing local street connectivity across US 59/I-69 between SH 288 and Spur 527 (Austin Street, Caroline Street, Eagle Street, etc.)
  - Response: TxDOT is evaluating this section of the roadway to improve circulation and mobility. TxDOT will also investigate the possibility of connecting as many roadways as possible in this section of US 59/I-69.
- Maintain Holman Street connectivity over highways
  - Response: TxDOT has worked closely with the City of Houston, HDMD, and EaDo to optimize the streets that would remain open. TxDOT has evaluated keeping Holman Street open, but due to the need to elevate SH 288 out of the depressed section in this area to reconnect with the existing SH 288, Holman Street could not connect over the highways.
- Maintain existing local street grid in Third Ward (Caroline Street, Cleburne Street, etc.)
  - Response: TxDOT will consider revisions in this area to improve the street grid in the Third Ward.
- Do not close Hamilton Street between Texas Street and Ruiz Street
  - Response: The current design for Hamilton Street does not include a Hamilton Street closure from Texas Street to Ruiz Street. The existing Hamilton Street is planned to remain open.

### 40. Response to comments that the public's input is not being incorporated into the development of alternatives

TxDOT and the other members of the project team take the public comment process very seriously and carefully consider all comments when evaluating alternatives and making decisions about the proposed project. The public's needs, ideas, and opinions – while not counted as votes – are an important part of the NEPA process. Final decisions on alternatives are based on engineering, traffic, and environmental criteria, in addition to public preferences. If a favored alternative does not score as well as others, it must be eliminated from further consideration, regardless of public support. TxDOT encourages continued public participation in the NEPA process so that all issues of concern are vetted.

### 41. Response to request to use the Hardy Toll Road rather than I-45

The Hardy Toll Road alternatives did not score well in traffic criteria evaluation because the traffic model predicts that users would not divert from I-45 to access the

Hardy Toll Road north of I-610. One of the alternatives studied included a direct connection between I-45 and the Hardy Toll Road along Beltway 8 and I-610. The traffic model showed the Beltway 8 connector would be used at only 30 percent or less of its capacity and the I-610 connector would be used at only 55 percent or less. In contrast, the MaX lanes alternatives along I-45 showed significantly higher use – from 73 to 85 percent higher than on Hardy Toll Road.

In addition, not enough traffic would be diverted to Hardy Toll Road to improve mobility and reduce congestion on I-45, as compared to other alternatives. The Hardy Toll Road alternatives would divert less than 3,500 vehicles daily from I-45 between Beltway 8 and I-610, whereas the other alternatives would divert 16,000 to 22,000 vehicles per day. From I-610 to I-10, the Hardy Toll Road alternatives would reduce I-45 traffic by about 10,000 vehicles daily, but other alternatives would reduce I-45 traffic by as much as 33,000 vehicles per day.

## 42. Response to comments regarding freeway-to-freeway access (direct connectors)

Various comments were received regarding freeway-to-freeway access, and access to and from the downtown area. Some comments were received regarding lane changes on short distances between direct connectors (moving from freeway to freeway). TxDOT is evaluating design modifications to maximize the distances provided between the direct connectors to improve traffic flow.

Some specific comments regarding freeway-to-freeway access are:

- Add an interchange between the I-45 MaX lanes and I-610
  - Response: Direct access from the I-45 MaX lanes to the I-610 direct connectors will be provided. See **Response 11**.
- Adjust the radius of the I-45 north to I-610 east director connector to minimize residential impacts
  - Response: The connector was designed to meet the minimum design criteria; TxDOT will evaluate potential adjustments to the design, if feasible.
- Connect to the planned future reconfiguration of the I-45 northbound connections to US 59/I-69 northbound and southbound
  - Response: TxDOT will design the connections to align with the proposed future improvements.

The proposed Downtown Connector, or Downtown Spur, was designed to generally maintain the same access points as the existing Pierce Elevated. The proposed design would require the reconstruction of some local streets due to changes in roadway profiles and roadway configurations. Some specific comments regarding access to and from the downtown area are:

- Provide a connection from westbound I-10 to the southbound Downtown Connector
  - Response: TxDOT has modified the design to include an additional direct connector from westbound I-10 to the Downtown Connector over White Oak Bayou.
- Provide a connection from I-45 northbound to the southbound Downtown Connector
  - Response: Connectivity from I-45 northbound to the west side of downtown will be provided via US 59/I-69 northbound to I-10 westbound. Alternately, access via the local street network will be provided via the St. Joseph Street/Pease Street exit from I-45.
- Improve access to and from the west side of downtown (i.e., add access from Allen Parkway and Memorial Drive) via the freeway network and the Downtown Connector
  - Response: TxDOT, in coordination with the City of Houston and the HDMD, will continue to evaluate modifications to the Downtown Connector to enhance connectivity and mobility. Modifications may include access outbound (I-10E, I-10W, and I-45N) on the Downtown Connector from Pease Street, Allen Parkway, and Walker Street. Adhering to the current configuration of Memorial Drive, no direct access will be provided to or from the Downtown Connector. This will allow Memorial Drive to retain its City of Houston designated functionality of moving high traffic volumes into and out of the downtown area. Access to Sabine Street will be provided via Allen Parkway.

### 43. Response to comments about the greenspace caps over the freeways, including funding source, and building greenspace caps concurrently with highway construction

To minimize right-of-way impacts, a below grade option was developed for portions of the project. Main lanes and MaX lanes would be below grade, while the frontage roads would maintain access at grade. This configuration provides an opportunity to use the area between the frontage roads as greenspace. This greenspace option is conceptual and would require separate development and funding. TxDOT is evaluating structural options for the greenspace sections. The date of construction and funding of the potential greenspace caps has not been determined, but will be further evaluated in future project phases in coordination with the City of Houston and relevant management districts. See **Response 14** for specific comments regarding additional locations of greenspace sections.

### 44. Response to comments regarding the alignment of the proposed highways

TxDOT continues to refine the alignments of the roadways presented at the public meeting in April 2015. Alignment modifications may be implemented due to shifts in

proposed roadway configurations, changes in curve radii, or as a result of public comments received. As the schematic design phase continues, TxDOT is evaluating areas that were noted in the comments received, including the following:

- US 59/I-69 at I-45 interchange, there is a narrowing of the trenched section with a curve for the northbound travel lanes
  - Response: TxDOT is evaluating straightening out the alignment of the US 59/I-69 general-purpose lanes, while providing a continuous northbound frontage road using the existing St. Emanuel Street.

## 45. Response to City of Houston comments

See attached letter below from the City of Houston Planning and Development Department dated May 29, 2015, with TxDOT responses. (City of Houston Comment letter is comment E 193.)

## 46. Response to METRO comments

See attached letter below from TXDOT to METRO's Planning, Engineering and Construction Department dated September 25, 2015, with responses to specific comments about potential impacts to METRO's operations. The responses in the letter correspond to the comments from the METRO letter dated June 2, 2015 (comment E 290).

## 47. Response to general comments

Other comments received were general in nature and have been noted by the project team.

CITY OF HOUSTON
Planning and Development

**Annise D. Parker**
Mayor

Patrick Walsh, P.E. Director
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562
T. 832.393.6600
F. 832.393.6661
www.houstontx.gov

May 29, 2015

Director of Project Development
Texas Department of
Transportation
P.O. Box 1386
Houston, Texas 77251-1386

**RE: Public Meeting #4 for North Houston Highway Improvement Project**

Dear Sir or Madam:

This letter provides comments of the City of Houston's Planning and Development Department (P&D) on the information presented at the 4th round of public meetings for the subject project held at the end of April 2015. P&D has reviewed the proposed recommended alternatives and offers the following observations:

**General Comments:**

- The City of Houston has adopted a Complete Streets policy to ensure streets are constructed for all users of the system. The City also required the streets should be built using a Context Sensitive Design guidelines as those recommended in the ITE - Design Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach and NACTO – Urban Street Design Guide, and others. Since the project location is within an urban area of the city, including the Downtown, any future engineering design should meet these guidelines.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- City of Houston is in the process of updating its Bicycle Master Plan and has been coordinating with TxDOT and other agencies in the region. Final recommendations to the Bicycle Master Plan will be provided to TxDOT for consideration of potential impacts to the proposed improvements on I-45 North.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- P&D does not support the proposed 15' shared use lane along frontage roads due to safety concerns arising from the speed differential between bicycles and other vehicles in these environments. Bicycle accommodations should be provided in the form of a 10' shared use path or protected bike lane. Note that the City is also updating its Infrastructure Design Manual and recommends on-street bike lanes to be 6' wide.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Ensure all bridges across the freeway and street crossings under the freeway provide for a minimum 6' unobstructed sidewalk.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Coordinate with METRO on proposed bus access to the managed lanes and transit centers, as well as on impacts to existing and proposed Light Rail Transit Corridors.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Further coordination with the City is needed to improve access between Downtown and all the adjacent neighborhoods including East Downtown, East End, First Ward, Second Ward Fourth Ward and the Near Northside. In many cases, access is currently limited and can be improved with the proposed project.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Evaluate the feasibility of an interconnected, continuous managed lane system surrounding Downtown. The proposed managed lanes for IH 45 North do not offer direct connection to other managed lanes facilities including IH 69/US 59 HOV lanes and the proposed express lanes for IH 10.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Evaluate the feasibility of accommodating future commuter rail along the managed lanes proposed for IH 45 North as a long-term strategy to offer additional travel options.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

**Segment 1**

- Evaluate the option to depress the freeway segment between Airline Drive and HB&T Railroad along the Northline Mall and Northside neighborhood to minimize community impact. The Northline Mall is a central community attraction for the Northside and Independence-Height neighborhoods. The freeway creates a physical barrier between the two neighborhoods. Depressing the freeway and limiting its impact on adjoining properties, similar to the IH 45 segment in the Heights, will maximize the use of the land and preserve the character of the neighborhoods.

  *TxDOT Response: A depressed freeway would limit access and visibility from I-45 for businesses in the area. The I-610 direct connectors and MaX lanes would still need to be elevated in this section, which would negate the benefits of depressing the I-45 main lanes. This section of I-45 is also in close proximity to Little White Oak Bayou, and elevating I-45 over the surface streets would be more desirable than depressing from a hydraulics standpoint.*

- Many intersections in Segment 1 are proposed with suburban intersection design considerations. This segment falls within an urban area and all intersections should be designed to improve pedestrian and bicycle accessibility. To this end, an intersection design that incorporates a free flow right turn lane with a pedestrian island creates an unsafe environment for pedestrians since many drivers do not yield to pedestrians at such intersections. Additionally, a number of intersections have dedicated right turn lanes. Ensure the traffic counts warrant dedicated right turns. 5-6 lane/multi-lane frontage roads are daunting for pedestrians to cross.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will coordinate with the City of Houston on all intersection designs.*

- Extend Pickering Street between Yale Street and IH 45 southbound frontage road.

  *TxDOT Response: The City of Houston withdrew this comment after discussion with TxDOT.*

- Yale Street and Twickenham Trail intersect at IH 45 northbound frontage road creating a Y intersection. Ensure appropriate design consideration to improve safe access at this intersection.

  *TxDOT Response: City of Houston to provide recommendation during final design phase.*

- Maintain existing connection from IH 45 northbound frontage road to Burress Street, south of Tidwell Road.

  *TxDOT Response: Design has been revised to maintain the existing connection.*

- Maintain existing connection from IH 45 southbound frontage road to Hidden Valley Drive, south of SH 249. This is the only east west location connection between SH 249 and Gulf Bank Road.

  *TxDOT Response: Design has been revised to maintain the existing connection.*

- Connect Blue Bell Road, between SH 249 and West Road, across IH 45 as a 2 lane underpass with pedestrian and bicycle accessibility. Blue Bell Road is being added to the City's Major Thoroughfare and Freeway plan consistent with the recommendations of the Northwest Mobility Study.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will evaluate providing an overpass at this location.*

- Ensure adequate clearance across Halls Bayou to allow for adequate natural drainage conveyance, and a pedestrian and bicycle trail along the bayou. These recommendations are consistent with the City's Bayou Greenway Initiative and HCFCD's Halls Bayou study.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Maintain the existing connection from the IH 45 frontage roads to Gillespie Street, south of Aldine Bender Road/Fallbrook Drive. Coordinate with the City of Houston to redesign the IH 45 interchange at Aldine Bender Road along the east side. The alignment of old Airline Road can be reconfigured to improve vehicular and pedestrian circulation within this area.

  *TxDOT Response: Design was modified to maintain the connection to Gillespie Street. Both parties agreed to add a cul-de-sac at the Aldine Bender Road intersection and provide a connection between the frontage road and local access street.*

**Segment 2**

- The proposed configuration of IH 610 at Irving Boulevard includes the removal of the westbound on ramp and the eastbound off ramp. Removal of these ramps would reduce access to Irvington Boulevard and the residential neighborhoods between IH 45 and US 59. Evaluate options to maintain the current on and off ramp configuration at IH 610 at Irving Boulevard.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Extend Melbourne Street to northbound IH 45 frontage road to create a T-intersection.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Realign the old IH 610 westbound frontage road to IH 45 northbound frontage road to create 90 degree 2-way street intersection at IH 610 westbound frontage road to improve local street circulation.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will evaluate the configuration of the I-610 frontage road.*

- Link Road underpass should accommodate 2 vehicular lanes, minimum 6' unobstructed sidewalk and 6' bike lanes.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Patton Street underpass should accommodate 4 vehicular lanes, minimum 6' unobstructed sidewalk and 6' bike lanes.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Coordinate with the City to evaluate two-way operation on Houston Avenue all the way to North Main Street.

  *TxDOT Response: The latest design includes a two-way roadway for Houston Avenue to North Main Street.*

- Consider preserving the on ramp connection from South Street to IH 45. If this is not feasible, extend South Street, as a two-way local street, to North Street at Mainford Street to preserve and improved local circulation.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

**Segment 3**

- Evaluate the feasibility for the reconstruction to allow for future two-way managed lane along US 59 and Spur 527.

  *TxDOT Response: The feasibility of two-way managed lanes will be evaluated in the upcoming TxDOT Preliminary Environmental Linkage studies.*

- Ensure curb radius at southwest corner of Main Street and US 59 to Main Street exit ramp is appropriate for an urban area with high pedestrian traffic.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Evaluate the feasibility of a green space deck, similar to the optional design proposed in Segment 2, through the Midtown section from Main Street to Almeda Road maintaining the connections of all local streets including Blodgett Street, Caroline Street, Austin Street and Cleburne Street. Even if not feasible at this time, the design should not preclude the capping of this section in the future.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will evaluate the feasibility of greenspace decking as the design is further refined.*

- Evaluate the option of shortening the SH 288 to US 59 S direct connector ramp or bringing its grade with US 59 sooner. This will be the only elevated structure west of SH288 through Midtown and appears to be the cause of many of the proposed disconnections in the street grid. The project should seek to increase the connectivity in this area, not reduce it.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will evaluate connectivity in the SH 288/US 59 area as the design is further refined.*

- Ensure 6' unobstructed sidewalk and 5’ minimum (6' desired) bike lanes along all proposed local street bridges and freeway underpasses.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Realign the SH 288 managed lanes from the proposed configuration that tie into Chenevert Street. Instead, divert the traffic to and from managed lane to Hamilton Street and Chartres Street which function as frontage roads. Alternatives may include tying directly near Elgin Street bridge or extending to McGowen Street or Gray Street. This configuration allows better access from Midtown and Third Ward neighborhoods to the SH 288 managed lanes.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT has evaluated this option, but design geometry will not allow for wishbone ramps at Hamilton Street and Chartres Street.*

- In the current proposal justify the need to widen Chenevert Street, south of Elgin Street, to 4 lanes when currently this segment to the SH 288 Toll Road is served by a single lane.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT and the City of Houston discussed this comment and agreed that the current configuration is acceptable.*

- Restore the historic street grid of Chenevert Street, Francis Street, and Holman Street rather than tying SH 288 southbound frontage road into Chenevert Street. Excess right of way may be converted to park space.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT and the City of Houston discussed this option and agreed that restoring the historic street grid will not be feasible.*

- Ensure proposed design does not preclude a green space deck, similar to the optional design proposed in Segment 2, over SH 288 and US 59 between Elgin Street and McGowen Street. Provisions should be included to allow future caps to be built easily and with minimal disruption.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will revise vertical profiles to accommodate the implementation of a potential greenspace cap in the future.*

- Evaluate opportunities for Holman Street to extend across US 59 to improve connectivity between Midtown and the Third Ward neighborhoods.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Polk Street is a critical east west connector between East Downtown and Downtown for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists. Evaluate the option to reconfigure the direct connector between IH 45 and US 59 to maintain the Polk Street connection. This could possibly be accomplished by moving the divergence of the ramps to/from IH 45 South three blocks north to Rusk Street. The connections of Lamar Street, McKinney Street, and Walker Street dead end at the convention center, and therefore far less important than Polk Street. Circulation can be provided by a two-way St. Emanuel Street (see next bullet).

  *TxDOT Response: Currently being evaluated by the City of Houston and Houston Downtown Management District.*

- The proposed expansion of the freeway eliminates St. Emanuel Street as a 2-way roadway. North-south circulation in East Downtown and the Second Ward is limited due to existing Union Pacific Railroad. Evaluate St. Emanuel Street as a 4 lane two-way roadway rather than a one-way northbound frontage road.

  *TxDOT Response: Hamilton Street southbound replaces the two-way St. Emanuel Street. The City of Houston agreed Hamilton Street would accommodate southbound circulation in east Downtown and the Second Ward. The City of Houston withdrew this comment after discussion with TxDOT.*

- Maintain Hamilton Street between Texas Avenue and Ruiz Street for local circulation. Coordinate with the City to evaluate a 2-way roadway configuration to improve circulation.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- The proposed design does not have any access to US 59 south from Downtown, East Downtown and Second Ward. Provide on-ramps to southbound US 59 main lanes in northern Downtown near Minute Maid stadium. This will allow residents and businesses Downtown and Second Ward area better access to US 59 southbound and SH 288.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Lane markings identified for Navigation Boulevard and Texas Avenue at US 59 are incorrect. Both streets provide two-way travel.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will revise the lane markings on the schematic design to address this.*

- City of Houston in coordination with the Gulf Coast Rail District in the process of designing a grade separation for Navigation Boulevard and Commerce Street at UPRR - West Belt Subdivision. Coordinate with the City to ensure the grade separation is taken into account in the proposed improvements associated with the IH 45 project.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- There is limited east west access between the Second Ward/East End and Downtown. Maintain/extend Runnels Street across the freeway to intersect McKey/Elysian Street Viaduct.

  *TxDOT Response: Currently being evaluated by the City of Houston and the Houston Downtown Management District.*

- Proposed design only allows eastbound connection from Nance Street and Rothwell Street to Jensen Drive. Provide westbound connection from Jensen Drive to Nance Street to maintain two-way east-west circulation. Ensure these connections are grade separated from BNSF Railroad.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT is evaluating options to maintain east-west circulation and grade separation with the BNSF rail line.*

- Provide an extension of IH 10 westbound frontage road across US 59 between Meadow Road and Schwartz Street to offer direct access to the west side of US 59.

  *TxDOT Response: Due to conflicts with vertical profiles, TxDOT cannot extend the I-10 westbound frontage road across US 59.*

- Consider extending the westbound frontage road along IH 10 under UPRR railroad between Semmes and Maury streets to avoid at-grade railroad crossing.

  *TxDOT Response: Semmes Street is a private road next to the Saint Arnold Brewery, and TxDOT cannot eliminate access to Semmes Street. The City of Houston withdrew this comment after discussion with TxDOT.*

- Extend Maury Street across IH 10 as it is the only road that offers at-grade crossing of UPRR within this area. Maury Street is a designated bicycle facility. Bicycle accommodations should be provided along Elysian Viaduct with the reconstruction.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will evaluate the extension of Maury Street and bicycle accommodations along Elysian Viaduct.*

- Maintain Gregg Street connection under IH 10.

  *TxDOT Response: The Gregg Street connection under I-10 is being maintained.*

- The proposed realignment of the freeway precludes the extension of the major thoroughfare San Jacinto Street north of IH 10 to Fulton Street as depicted on the City's Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan. This limits north south access between Downtown and the Northside neighborhoods. Coordinate with the City to preserve the potential to extend San Jacinto Street to Fulton across IH 10 and Union Pacific Rail Road, consistent with the City's Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan.

  *TxDOT Response: The project design will allow for a future San Jacinto Street underpass.*

- Provide access to and from Memorial Drive to the Downtown Connectors.

  *TxDOT Response: The City of Houston withdrew this comment after discussion with TxDOT.*

- The proposed design along the west side of Downtown limits access between the Fourth Ward and Downtown. Evaluate the option of extending the proposed Downtown Connectors to align along Heiner Street. This would eliminate the need for two sets of roadways adjacent to each other. Additionally, the street grid between Downtown and Fourth ward would be reinstated, thus improving accessibility and connectivity in this area.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- West Dallas Street is a designated Major Collector on the City's Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan. Maintain West Dallas Street across the Pease-Jefferson direct connectors by keeping the Downtown Connectors elevated across Dallas Street, or, preferably, by keeping them depressed like the existing cross section.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- A significant number of residents in the Fourth Ward cross under IH 45 on foot at Jefferson Street and St. Joseph Parkway. Evaluate options for pedestrian and bicycle connection at Andrews Street to improve safety and accessibility for pedestrians.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will consider a location to cross pedestrians under the connectors along Andrews Street.*

- Justify the need for 6 lanes along Heiner Street between Allen Parkway and Brazos Street, as it will no longer carry freeway ramp volumes. Consideration should be given to providing bicycle and pedestrian connectivity between Midtown and Buffalo Bayou in this corridor.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- The intersection of Allen Parkway and Houston Avenue/Heiner Street should be designed to ensure safe pedestrian and bicycle access given the proximity to the Buffalo Bayou Park, Sam Houston Park and other recreational destinations. The intersection should be designed as an urban core thoroughfare intersection with 6'-8' wide pedestrian refuge and other pedestrian and bicycle safety features.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Coordinate with the City to evaluate an alternative reconfiguration to access the freeway from the Walker/McKinney ingress-egress ramp. Consider an option that consolidates the access to south of the City Hall Annex on McKinney Street to create a better connection between the Buffalo Bayou and Downtown along Walker Street. Consider a two-way configuration on McKinney Street for at least several blocks. Rethink the area between the City Hall Annex and the Theater District as an extension of the Buffalo Bayou Park connecting to Tranquility Park.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- Hogan Street bridge should accommodate 4 vehicular lanes, minimum 6' unobstructed sidewalk and 6' bike lanes.

  *TxDOT Response: The Hogan Street bridge will be reconstructed, and TxDOT will evaluate the bicycle lane and sidewalk needs during the schematic phase.*

- The Houston Avenue bridge across IH 10 should accommodate 4 vehicular lanes, minimum 6' unobstructed sidewalk and 6' bike lanes.

  *TxDOT Response: The Houston Avenue bridge will be reconstructed, and TxDOT will evaluate the bicycle lane and sidewalk needs during the schematic phase.*

- The Quitman/White Oak Street bridge should accommodate 2 vehicular lanes, minimum 6' unobstructed sidewalk and 6' bike lanes.

  *TxDOT Response: The Quitman Street/White Oak Street bridge will be reconstructed, and TxDOT will evaluate the bicycle lane and sidewalk needs during the schematic phase.*

- Ensure adequate clearance across Little White Oak Bayou to allow for adequate natural drainage conveyance, and pedestrian and bicycle accessibility along the bayou consistent with the City's bikeway map for off-street facilities.

  *TxDOT Response: Comment noted.*

- The local street grid should be fully reestablished where IH 10 is being removed near UH-Downtown.

  *TxDOT Response: TxDOT will work with the City of Houston and the Houston Downtown Management District to optimize connectivity.*

Thank you for the consideration of these comments. If beneficial, we would be glad to sit down with your office to review these comments individually. We look forward to your response to P&D's comments on this project.

Sincerely,

Patrick Walsh, P.E., Director Planning &
Development Department

PW:AM/jw

cc: Dale Rudick, P.E. Public Works and Engineering Department, Director
Andy Icken, Chief Development Officer
Alan Clark, Director, Houston-Galveston Area Council
Quincy Allen, P.E., District Engineer, Texas Department of Transportation

Texas Department of Transportation®
P.O. BOX 1386 | HOUSTON, TEXAS 77251-1386 | (713) 802-5000 | WWW.TXDOT.GOV

September 25, 2015

Robert Trevino, Executive Vice President
Planning, Engineering & Construction
Metropolitan Transit Authority
1900 Main Street
P.O. Box 61429
Houston, Texas 77208

RE: North Houston Highway Improvement Project
I-45: From Beltway 8 to I-69
Control 0110-06-132, etc.

Dear Mr. Trevino:

The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has reviewed METRO's comments on the Proposed Recommended Alternative for the North Houston Highway Improvement Project (NHHIP). We have noted all comments and offer the following responses to specific comments about potential impacts to METRO's operations. The comments are numbered to correspond to the numbers in METRO's letter dated June 2, 2015.

Please note that based on public comments, we are now referring to the managed lanes as MaX (Managed eXpress) lanes. The operational characteristics of the MaX lanes are no different from the managed lanes presented at Public Meeting No. 4.

General Comments:

1. *"The proposed recommended alternative would increase METRO's operation costs. We estimate that the revenue hour impact to METRO of closing the Downtown HOV Connector would be approximately $3.5 million/year. The revenue hour impact to METRO of decreasing access to I-45 N from Downtown is estimated to be approximately $8.4 million/year. These amounts do not include the non-revenue costs or the costs of buying new buses to maintain on time performance."*

   The project replaces the existing reversible HOV/HOT lane on I-45 with two-way MaX lanes that are accessible 24 hours a day. These improvements will increase accessibility between I-45 and Downtown and provide an overall benefit for METRO's operations.

   The Proposed Recommended Alternative will also improve connectivity between I-10 and Downtown. I-10 W traffic will have a separate exit to the Downtown Connector and be able to access Downtown streets without having to get on I-45 as it does today. Additionally, in response to Metro's concerns about removing the Downtown HOV Connector, a separate bus/HOV lane has been added between I-10 W and Smith/Louisiana.

2. *"The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funded some of the ramp connectors to Downtown. If the ramps are removed, the FTA would require partial reimbursement for those facilities. For example, the existing CBD Connector Ramp from I-10 W to Franklin Street will be removed and not replaced. Since the ramp was funded by the FTA, METRO would be required to reimburse FTA for the non-depreciated costs of the structure. The costs of any FTA reimbursements should be included in the total project cost."*

   Please see response to Comment 1.

2A. *"TxDOT's plan does not show the transition from bi-directional managed lanes to the reversible barrier separated HOV/HOT lane. There is a note to connect to 'future managed lanes.'"*

   The proposed MaX lanes tie to a planned project north of BW 8 that would reconfigure the reversible HOV/HOT to two lanes with one lane in each direction. The transition shown in the NHHIP Proposed Recommended Alternative can be modified if those plans change.

3. *"METRO does not know the plan for HOV enforcement on the managed lanes. It should be considered early in the planning phase to ensure that the most efficient enforcement is provided."*

   Comment noted. Enforcement will be studied in more detail after the Public Hearing.

4. *"METRO wants to better understand the impacts to the East End and Southeast LRTs if I-45 N is reconstructed parallel to US 59 S on the southeast side of Downtown."*

   In the Proposed Recommended Alternative, US 59 (I-69) will be converted from elevated to depressed. The existing East End and Southeast LRT lines that currently go under the freeway will be reconstructed so that the freeway goes under both lines. TxDOT is developing a constructability plan that will be reviewed with METRO. The goal is to limit disruption to the operations of both lines during construction.

5. *"METRO would need to work with TxDOT to develop a plan that minimizes impacts to its service and operations during construction."*

   Agree. We will coordinate with METRO to minimize construction impacts.

6. *"METRO has an agreement with the City of Houston that defines on which streets METRO buses can operate. That agreement may be impacted by TxDOT's plan."*

   TxDOT has been working closely with the City of Houston on Segment 3 elements with a focus on maintaining as much of the existing agreement as possible. We will invite METRO to a workshop with the City prior to the Public Hearing to discuss any revisions that might impact the agreement.

Segment 1: Beltway 8 to I-610

7. *Although the schematics maintain the T-Ramp at Crosstimbers, TxDOT has requested that METRO consider eliminating the ramp. There is an inbound slip ramp from inbound I-45 managed lanes and a slip ramp to outbound I-45 managed lanes about 9,000 feet*

*(1-3/4 mi.) north of this location to replace these movements. This is the same slip ramp mentioned in Comment 11 below. The Crosstimbers T-Ramp should be preserved to accommodate anticipated growth in the Nothline Transit Center area. Elimination of this structure would result in buses operating in the congested main lanes from Crosstimbers to Downtown.*

TxDOT received public comments requesting the addition of ramps between the I-45 MaX lanes and the I-610 direct connectors. These ramps would allow MaX lane users to access I-610 without having to weave across the I-45 main lanes.

We analyzed adding these ramps and determined that they would need to be in approximately the same location as the existing Crosstimbers T-Ramp. Accommodating both the I-610 ramps and the T-ramp at this location resulted in geometry that did not meet design criteria.

8. *"A T-Ramp direct connection to the North Shepherd Park and Ride lot would be added. It would only be used by one bus route (the 212 Seton Lake). The North Shepherd lot is not anticipated to grow demand. This facility is essential for delivery of service.*

   The Shepherd Park and Ride T-Ramp was included in the NHHIP alternatives to replace the existing access points. If METRO feels these access points are no longer warranted, we will remove the T-Ramp. Please note that if this T-Ramp is removed, buses and MaX lane users will have to exit via a slip ramp and weave across the mainlanes to access the Park and Ride.

9. *"The proposed recommended alternative maintains the wishbone ramp at Aldine Bender. It provides two lanes in each direction from downtown to the wishbone ramp and one lane in each direction from there to Beltway 8."*

   Comment noted.

Segment 2: I-610 to I-10

10. *"Northbound connectivity from Houston Avenue to North Main should be preserved in order to reduce cut-through traffic through the Woodland Heights neighborhood. METRO Route 44 will use this connection once System Reimagining is implemented in August. Losing that connection would result in placing two local routes inside neighborhoods which have opposed the New Bus Network."*

    Concur. We have revised the Proposed Recommended Alternative between North Main and I-10 to continue two-way traffic flow along Houston Avenue up to North Main.

11. *"The proposed recommended alternative eliminates direct connection to/from Quitman and direct connection to westbound I-10 and from eastbound I-10. A slip ramp to outbound I-45 and from inbound I-45 managed lanes is provided about 16,000 feet (3 miles) north of this location to replace these movements. METRO is concerned that the distance will require drivers to navigate through the most congested section of I-45."*

    Direct connection between I-10 and the I-45 MaX lanes to the north is not feasible due to geometric constraints. However, we are investigating adding a set of slip ramps between North Main and I-610 in Segment 2 which would allow users to travel further in the MaX lanes before needing to exit.

12. *"Flood mitigation is a concern for the depressed section of I-45 N from Cavalcade to Quitman."*

    **We are conducting a drainage study to identify existing deficiencies in the roadway drainage system that can be improved with the NHHIP and to ensure that the proposed design does not contribute to additional localized flooding.**

Segment 3: Downtown Loop System

13. *"TxDOT's plans show that the Heiner Street layover (on the west side of Downtown) would be removed. This site is currently used to layover routes from three freeway corridor and the Woodlands Express. If the Pierce Elevated is removed, METRO requests that TxDOT preserve a portion of the space underneath for a new Downtown METRO bus layover."*

    **Please see response to Comment 6. We will discuss this further at the planned workshop.**

14. *"Several of the connections from Downtown streets to the freeway system will be removed. METRO is very concerned about the implications of those removals to its service."*

    a. *St. Joseph will not have an entrance ramp to northbound I-45, eastbound I-10 or westbound I-10, concentrating traffic on Pease.*

       **We conducted a detailed traffic study in conjunction with the City of Houston to analyze the interaction between the Proposed Recommended Alternative and the Downtown street network. This study determined that the flow into and out of Downtown will be properly balanced between all the access points.**

    b. *There will no longer be an entrance to northbound I-45 from Louisiana, concentrating traffic on Travis.*

       **Correct. The existing HOV/HOT access points from Louisiana and Travis have been combined into a two-lane access point from Travis. Please see response to 14.a.**

    c. *There will no longer be an eastbound exit from I-10 to Dallas, Jefferson or Pierce. This traffic will have to take U-59 southbound, exit on the east side of Downtown and use surface streets for access to the west side of the Downtown area or exit onto Providence Street to Naylor/San Jacinto. It would then use surface streets again to get to the west side of Downtown.*

       **Dallas, Jefferson, and Pierce are currently accessed via the existing left-handed I-45/I-10 ramp, which contributes to the bottleneck at that location during peak hours. With the Proposed Recommended Alternative, I-10 will have a separate access point to these streets via the Downtown Connector.**

    d. *The northbound exits from I-45 to Allen Parkway and Memorial Drive will be eliminated. METRO is concerned that the removal will reduce access to those roads.*

       **Correct. We were not able to provide I-45 northbound traffic with direct access to Allen Parkway and Memorial Drive. They will now access these streets by either 1) exiting to St. Joseph, or 2) exiting to I-69N/I-10W and exiting to the Downtown Connector on the west side of Downtown. The Segment 3 Proposed Recommended**

Alternative does increase the travel distance to some destinations, but the travel time is reduced as a result of the systemwide flow improvements.

TxDOT appreciates METRO's comments and will continue to coordinate with METRO as we further develop this important project.

If you need more information, please contact Pat Henry, P.E. at, (713) 802-5241.

Sincerely,

Pat Henry, P.E.
Director of Project Development
Houston District

cc: Wahida Wakil, P.E.

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Abbott | Ashley E. | | W 679 | 24 |
| Ackley | Benjamin | | W 586 | 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 39, 42, 47 |
| Adams | Craig | | W 574 | 29 |
| Adams | Conway | | E 228 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Aguilar | Johnny | | PM 104 | 47 |
| Aguilar Sr. | Johnny | | PM 126 | 14, 17 |
| Ahmadi | Saman | | W 523 | 29 |
| Alexander | Michael | | E 174 | 6, 16 |
| Alexander | Michael | Bel Emanuel Holdings LLC | M 38 | 6, 16 |
| Almond | Anna | | E 283 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Alvarado | Elaine | | W 492 | 29 |
| Andrew | Bob | | W 581 | 29 |
| Antley | Britt | | W 533 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Arnold | Christopher | | W 512 | 29, 47 |
| Atkinson | Alan | | E 208 | 3, 4, 33, 39, 42, 47 |
| Bailey | James | | W 509 | 1, 10, 29, 42, 44, 47 |
| Baker | Alan | | PM 82 | 38 |
| Bard | Laura | | PM 99 | 8, 39 |
| Bard | Scott | | PM 100 | 33, 39 |
| Barnum | Daniel | | E 155 | 2, 3, 17, 18, 26, 39, 47 |
| Bautista Jr. | Raul | | PM 70 | 26, 27 |
| Benitez | Victor | | W 454 | 29 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Bennett | Donna | | E 220 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Bernlo | Elizabeth Garcia | | PM 117 | 9, 23, 47 |
| Bieber | Kennan | | W 583 | 29 |
| Bingham | Bradley | | W 477 | 29 |
| Blair | Sandra | | W 501 | 33, 39 |
| Blake | Frank | | W 666 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Blake | Frank | | E 227 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Blazek Crossley | Jay | HoustonTomorrow | W 697 | 1, 2, 17, 19, 22, 29, 30, 43 |
| Blazek Crossley | Jay | HoustonTomorrow | W 698 | 4, 15, 17, 18, 23, 32 |
| Blieden | Mervyn | | PM 125 | 6 |
| Blieden | Mervyn | | PM 130 | 2, 8, 43, 47 |
| Blieden | Mervyn | | PM 137 | 2 |
| Blitzer | Mary | BikeHouston | E 191 | 17, 18, 32 |
| Block | Eric | | W 476 | 1, 29, 42 |
| Boisseau | Charles | | W 461 | 29 |
| Bond | Claudia | | W 467 | 29 |
| Borstmayer | Erin | | W 571 | 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 39, 42, 47 |
| Boubel Smith | Jeannine | | E 165 | 1, 47 |
| Bowlin | Mike | | PM 122 | 47 |
| Bradshaw | Joe | | W 452 | 29 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Bratsen | Steve | | PM 79 | 33, 42 |
| Briedel | William H. | | PM 132 | 47 |
| Broussard | Matt | | PM 75 | 6, 7, 33, 38, 43, 47 |
| Brown | Bonnie | | W 654 | 4, 33 |
| Brown | Bonnie G. | | E 234 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Bryn | Peter | | W 497 | 1, 3, 14, 18, 26, 29, 34, 35, 39, 42, 47 |
| Budker | Bart | | PM 119 | 47 |
| Burke | Kristen & Kevin | | E 156 | 4, 5, 8, 17, 33, 39 |
| Burke | Lucky | Reader's Wholesale Distributors | M 37 | 16, 27 |
| Buruum | Dan | | PM 95 | 3, 18, 39 |
| Butler | Katherine L. | | W 676 | 29 |
| Butler | Katherine L. | | E 212 | 29 |
| Butsch | Catherine | Houston Parks Board | E 196 | 10, 14, 17, 18, 39, 47 |
| Butsch | Catherine | Houston Parks Board | E 262 | 10, 14, 17, 18, 39, 47 |
| C | Nina | | W 485 | 29 |
| Cafferky | Sean | | W 510 | 29 |
| Campestre | Alison | | W 472 | 3, 36 |
| Campos | Ariana | Rep. Jessica Farrar | E 195 | 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 33 |
| Carranco | Richard A. | | PM 121 | 6, 16 |
| Carvajal | Nicolas | | W 453 | 29 |
| Cates | Ann | | E 179 | 47 |
| Caul | Carol | Citizens' Transportation Coalition | E 289 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 23, 28, 29, |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| | | | | 31, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 43, 47 |
| Cavazos | Sylvia | Civic Board Member | PM 146 | 5, 6, 16, 27, 40 |
| Charles | Eloise | | E 233 | 29 |
| Cho | Peter | | W 641 | 47 |
| Cho | Sharon | | PM 107 | 47 |
| Cho | Marena | | PM 111 | 47 |
| Cho | Peter | | PM 113 | 47 |
| Chong | Lin | | PM 133 | 47 |
| Cintron | Rose | | W 525 | 10 |
| Clark | Florence | | W 610 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Clark | Tim | Cypress Real Estate Advisors | E 245 | 26, 27 |
| Clark | Florence | | E 267 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Clark | Florence | | E 268 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Clark | Florence | | E 269 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Clark | Tim | Cypress Real Estate Advisors | M 46 | 26, 27 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Clark | Alan | H-GAC | M 48 | 3, 7, 11, 14, 18, 33, 38, 39, 42 |
| Coburn | Ross | | W 585 | 29 |
| Cognata | Thomas | | PM 88 | 8, 44, 47 |
| Collins | Michael | Refinery Restaurant | W 552 | 7, 39 |
| Connett | Diana | | W 480 | 29 |
| Consolvo | Wayne | | E 264 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Cook | Jacqueline | | W 534 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Cook | Jacqueline | | M 39 | 4, 5, 8, 17, 33, 39 |
| Cornejo | Josh | | W 579 | 29 |
| Cornejo | Jennifer | | W 588 | 29 |
| Craig | Carly | | W 618 | 29 |
| Crippen | Louis | | W 566 | 10, 39 |
| Cross | Renee | | E 218 | 3, 4, 5, 18, 33, 39 |
| Cross | Stan | | E 221 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Cuevas | Pablo | On Power | PM 65 | 7 |
| Culver | Doug | | W 503 | 34 |
| Currier | Helen | | W 602 | 47 |
| Dailey | Scott | | W 608 | 47 |
| Dang | David | Restaurant owner | PM 116 | 7 |
| Danna | Phyllis & Greg | | W 531 | 6, 16, 17 |
| Danna | Phyllis & Greg | | M 44 | 6, 16, 17 |
| Davis | Blaine | | W 473 | 8, 26, 27, 29 |
| Davis | Beth | | W 587 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Davis | Jeanette | | W 636 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Davis | Jeanette | | E 239 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Demar Hall | Maureen | | E 259 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Derry | Jon | | W 637 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Dethloff Grenne | Chris | | E 240 | 29 |
| Devries | Ronald | | W 483 | 29 |
| Deyo | Jason | | PM 72 | 6, 7 |
| Diaz | Alex | | PM 73 | 11 |
| Dilbeck | Jeremy | | E 288 | 4, 8, 10, 33 |
| Dirst | Matthew | | W 648 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Dominguez | Mariano | | W 693 | 7, 10, 33, 39, 47 |
| Donahue | Kay E. | | W 569 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Donahue | Kay | | E 157 | 4, 5 |
| Donahue | Kay | | E 158 | 4, 5, 8, 17, 33, 39 |
| Donovan | Matthew | | W 498 | 7, 8, 9, 16, 18, 39 |
| Dornbusch | Tom | SN22 Council | E 206 | 3, 4, 14, 17, 18, 29, 36, 39, 42, 43 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Douglas | Allen | | PM 91 | 29 |
| Dower | Margaret | | E 278 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Doyle | Theresa | | W 642 | 29 |
| Drake | James | J.A. Drake Companies, Inc. | E 243 | 43 |
| Dubec | Jeri | | E 238 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| DuCroz | Diana | | E 216 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Duke | Virginia | | W 495 | 33, 47 |
| Durbin | Donna | | W 639 | 29 |
| Dvoretzky | Rachel | | PM 112 | 47 |
| Eddins | Rachel | | W 536 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Edsall | Julie | | W 589 | 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 39, 42, 47 |
| Ellis | Mary | | E 151 | 29 |
| Emde | Katy | | W 699 | 5, 6, 16, 20, 33, 39, 47 |
| Emde | Katy | | E 285 | 5, 6, 33, 39, 47 |
| Emde | Katy | | E 286 | 5, 6, 33, 39, 47 |
| Emde | Katy | | PM 102 | 33 |
| Engle | Justin | | E 270 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| | | | | 43, 44, 47 |
| Espinosa | Estella | | E 201 | 4, 5, 33, 39 |
| Fernandez III | Nelson A. | Business owner | PM 92 | 3, 7 |
| Field | Carole | | W 482 | 47 |
| Filipow | Sean | | E 275 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Fischer | Stephen | | W 529 | 4, 39 |
| Fischer | Stephen | | E 211 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Fitzgerald | Christine | | W 653 | 10 |
| Fitzgerald | Christine | | E 235 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Flowers | Steve | | W 606 | 29 |
| Fortes | Paul | | W 652 | 29 |
| Foster | Eva | | W 484 | 29 |
| Fudge | Dawn | Last Concert Café | PM 114 | 3 |
| Gamill | Cecil | | PM 67 | 6 |
| Garcia | David A. | | PM 120 | 6, 16 |
| Garcia | M. Robert | | PM 139 | 1 |
| Garcia | Marlene | | PM 142 | 28, 31 |
| Garcia-Prats | Mark | | W 542 | 9, 26, 27 |
| Garrett | David | | W 701 | 10, 29, 33, 39, 47 |
| Garwood | Will | | W 620 | 5, 12, 17, 18 |
| Garza | Janie | | PM 134 | 6, 7, 16, 47 |
| Gattis | Tory | Editor, Houston Strategies Blog | E 167 | 11, 29, 38, 39, 42 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Gattis | Tory | Editor, Houston Strategies Blog | E 170 | 11, 33, 38, 39, 42 |
| Gattis | Tory | Editor, Houston Strategies Blog | PM 81 | 29, 42 |
| Gentile | Joseph | | W 611 | 29 |
| George | Maria | | W 688 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| George | Peter | | W 689 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| George | Maria | | W 690 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| George | Peter | | W 691 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Glazner | Kim | | W 493 | 29 |
| Glynn | Peter | | W 464 | 29 |
| Goings | Tim | | E 271 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Goldsmith | Anne | | E 202 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Gonzalez Ahumanda | Carlos | | W 609 | 47 |
| Graham | Susan | | E 226 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Greenspan | Marcus | | W 532 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Greenspan | Heather | | W 695 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Griffith | Rob | | PM 135 | 47 |
| Gue | Jerel | | W 614 | 29 |
| Gulec | Ozge | | W 615 | 29 |
| Gulec | Ozge | | W 651 | 29 |
| Hall | William Blake | | E 273 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| | | | | 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Harris | Margaret A | | W 635 | 29 |
| Hart | Maureen | | W 475 | 29 |
| Hart | Maureen | | E 152 | 29 |
| Hart | Milby | | M 41 | 29 |
| Harrison | Abby | | W 702 | 22, 47 |
| Hawkins | Kendall | | W 570 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Hayslip | Mary | | W 535 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Hayslip | Mary | | W 660 | 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 33, 39, 42, 43 |
| Hayslip | Mary | | PM 98 | 4, 39 |
| Heger | Wendy | | W 703 | 29 |
| Heger | Wendy | | E 291 | 29 |
| Helm | Tom | | E 253 | 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 33, 39, 42, 43 |
| Hendricks | Julie | | E 274 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Henke | Greg | | W 489 | 4, 8, 16, 33, 39 |
| Henn | Lydia | | W 686 | 33 |
| Henn | Lydia | | PM 85 | 10, 36 |
| Henry | Mary Lou | | W 634 | 1, 39 |
| Heredia | Natalia | | W 458 | 29 |
| Hernandez | Martha | | W 568 | 31 |
| Hernandez | Grace | | W 685 | 29 |
| Hesser | William | | W 584 | 29 |
| Hoffman | Kevin J | | W 526 | 6, 33, 39 |
| Hoffman | Kevin J | | M45 | 3, 11, 12, 18, 20, 31, 33, 39, 42 |
| Holden | Stacy | | W 659 | 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 39, |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| | | | | 42, 47 |
| Horton | Otis | | W 630 | 29 |
| House | Jennifer | | W 479 | 29 |
| Houston | Becky | President of Friends of Woodland Park, Inc. | W 667 | 4, 5, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 39, 43, 47 |
| Howe | Cymene | | W 468 | 29 |
| Howe | H Milton | | W 543 | 42, 47 |
| Hoyt | Sharon | | W 647 | 47 |
| Hupp | Steve | Bayou Preservation Association | E 192 | 10, 14, 15, 18, 23 |
| Hysinger | Larry | | W 625 | 29 |
| Jander | Stefan | | W 644 | 29 |
| Joachim | Kathy | | E 229 | 4, 5, 27, 33, 43 |
| Joachim | Kathy | | E 230 | 4, 5, 27, 33, 43 |
| Johnson | Aaron | | W 558 | 1, 4, 5, 29, 47 |
| Jones | Renate | | W 607 | 29 |
| Jones | Stephanie | | W 700 | 4, 24, 29, 39 |
| Joseph | Gijo | | E 281 | 47 |
| Keeling | Ken | | E 263 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Kellogg | Paul | | W 530 | 33, 39 |
| Kelly | David | | W 670 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Kern | Nancy | | E 213 | 19, 39, 47 |
| Killian | Robert | | E 255 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| | | | | 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| King | Kathryn | | W 694 | 4, 5, 18, 39 |
| Klein | Barry | | W 664 | 47 |
| Kline | Erin | | W 466 | 29 |
| Knape | Patrick | | W 576 | 47 |
| Knapp | Karin | | M 43 | 29 |
| Koevigs | John | | PM 127 | 8 |
| Koevigs | John | | PM 128 | 20 |
| Kraft | Michelle | | W 600 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Krouskop | Sara | | W 540 | 1, 28, 31, 42 |
| Kwari | Andy | | W 623 | 29 |
| Large | Monte | | PM 77 | 4, 8, 9, 34 |
| Large | Monte | | PM 84 | 29 |
| Larimore | James | | E 176 | 2, 3, 33, 38 |
| LaRotta | Alex | | W 490 | 29 |
| Lawler | Patricia | | E 203 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Lawler | Mary | | E 207 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Lee | Robert S. | White Oak Bayou Association | E 223 | 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 23 |
| Lee | Ji | | PM 66 | 47 |
| Lennon | Patti | | W 619 | 47 |
| Lenz | Paula | | E 180 | 47 |
| Lenz | Paula | | E 184 | 47 |
| Lerma Pfeifer | Diana | | W 617 | 29 |
| Liffman | Carol | | W 463 | 29 |
| Liffman | Paul M | | W 465 | 29 |
| Lilley | Jim | | PM 90 | 17, 43 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Lindner | J. Fred | | PM 148 | 33, 47 |
| Lindow Jr. | Kenneth T | | W 605 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Lindsay | Lee & Lauren | | E 154 | 4, 5, 8, 17, 33, 39 |
| Lindsay | Larissa | | E 260 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Lindsay | Lauren | | E 261 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Lindsay | Lee | | E 277 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Link | David | | W 505 | 42 |
| Livingston | J | | W 442 | 37 |
| Livingston | J | | W 444 | 37 |
| Locks | Joseph | | E 265 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Lohr | Alvina & Roger | | W 631 | 29 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Long | John | | W 655 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47(complete list of response numbers for this commenter) |
| Long | John | | W 656 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47(complete list of response numbers for this commenter) |
| Long | John | | W 657 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47(complete list of response numbers for this commenter) |
| Long | John | | W 658 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47(complete list of response numbers for this commenter) |
| Longoria | Marc | | PM 87 | 33, 39, 47 |
| Lousteau | Elizabeth | | W 511 | 18, 26, 39 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Lowe | Pam | | E 258 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Loya | Lisa | | E 160 | 3, 47 |
| Lunstroth | Jost | | W 593 | 29 |
| Lunstroth | Jost | | W 680 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Lynch | Sandra | | W 616 | 29 |
| Lynch | Sandra | | E 254 | 29 |
| M | Jamie | | E 252 | 47 |
| Mahler | Monique | | W 622 | 29 |
| Mann | Lisa | | W 478 | 29 |
| Marshall | Rex | | W 507 | 11 |
| Marshall | Rex | | W 508 | 39, 42 |
| Martin | Cindy | | E 280 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Martinec | Lonne | | W 527 | 33 |
| Martinez Perry | Mary Louise | | W 626 | 4, 5 |
| Mastal | Megan | | W 669 | 29 |
| Mastal | Megan | | E 217 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Mastal | Megan | | PM 138 | 3, 29, 39, 41 |
| May | John | M&T International, Inc. | PM 115 | 47 |
| McCarra | Travis | | W 594 | 29 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| McConn | Tim | Woodland Heights Civic Association | W 675 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| McKenna | Audrey | | W 580 | 29 |
| Mclemore | Mel | | W 640 | 29 |
| McSherry | Jim | | W 562 | 3 |
| McWhorter | William A. | | W 450 | 1, 4, 11, 29, 42 |
| Meaney | Robert | | W 515 | 13, 33 |
| Meeks | Rev. Randall C. | A/G Church | PM 64 | 5, 33 |
| Mendoza | Angie | | E 183 | 47 |
| Mendoza | Marina | | PM 86 | 10, 28, 31 |
| Merrick | Tami | | W 563 | 3, 31, 47 |
| Merrick | Tami | | E 197 | 29 |
| Merrick | Tami | | E 282 | 12, 14, 17, 18, 47 |
| Merritt | Tim | | PM 143 | 33, 39, 47 |
| Meyer | Neal | | W 564 | 1, 2, 3, 35, 37, 38, 47 |
| Meyers | Martha | | W 678 | 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 16, 18, 33, 39, 42, 47 |
| Michaelides | Evan | | W 673 | 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 39, 42, 47 |
| Michaelides | Evan | | W 674 | 29 |
| Michaelides | Laura | | W 683 | 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 39, 42, 47 |
| Michaelides | Evan | First Ward Civic Council | E 188 | 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 39, 42, 47 |
| Middleton | Joseph | | E 200 | 5, 11, 33, 39, 42 |
| Miles | Karen | | W 671 | 39 |
| Miller | Andrea | | W 524 | 10, 38 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Minton | Martha | | W 677 | 33 |
| Minton | M | | PM 106 | 33 |
| Mireles | Herminia | | PM 123 | 47 |
| Mladenka | Blaise | | E 171 | 29 |
| Monhite | Amar | City of Houston Planning & Development Dept. | E 193 | 45 |
| Morales | Ignacio | | W 446 | 6 |
| Morales | Jesus | | W 447 | 5, 8, 9, 29, 37 |
| Morris | David B. | | W 554 | 29 |
| Moschioni | John | | W 613 | 29 |
| Moss | Louise | | E 198 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Mueller | Deborah | | W 487 | 29 |
| Murphy | Sean | | W 672 | 26, 29 |
| Muscara | Joe | | E 279 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Myers | Rodrick | | W 604 | 29 |
| Nagai | Tyler | | W 704 | 29 |
| Nelson | Jennifer | | W 684 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Newport | Jonathan | Houston First Corporation | W 629 | 7, 43, 47 |
| Newton | Michael D | | W 633 | 29 |
| Nguyen | Hai | | W 559 | 32 |
| Niemann | Katie | | W 599 | 29 |
| Norboge | Nick | | E 182 | 2, 3, 11 |
| Norton | Joseph | | W 451 | 5, 8, 9, 10, 16 |
| Norton | Joseph | | W 663 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Nosser | Elaine | | W 650 | 29 |
| O'Connor | Mike | | W 548 | 39 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Last Name | First Name | Affiliation | Comment Code | Response |
| O'Connor | Mike | | W 549 | 26 |
| O'Connor | Mike | | W 550 | 1, 38, 42, 47 |
| O'Connor | Mike | | W 555 | 1, 4, 47 |
| O'Connor | Mike | | W 556 | 22 |
| O'Connor | Mike | | W 627 | 22 |
| O'Connor | Terry | | PM 101 | 17, 22, 32, 47 |
| O'Connot | Thomas | | W 545 | 33 |
| Olds | Rosalinda | | E 214 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| O'Michael | Michelle | | W 638 | 6, 29 |
| Orseck | Ellen | | W 612 | 29 |
| Ortiz | Oscar | | PM 71 | 31, 47 |
| Oshman | Mollie | | W 541 | 39 |
| Pannell | Ellen | Brookfield, Property Manager | W 504 | 18, 47 |
| Parente | Nicola | | E 257 | 29 |
| Parker | Wendy | Germantown Historic District | E 185 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Patel | Jay | | W 459 | 29 |
| Patel | Bimal | | PM 76 | 1, 38 |
| Patel | Hasud | Business owner | PM 108 | 7, 33 |
| Patel | Hasud | Business owner | PM 109 | 7, 33 |
| Patel | Hasud | Business owner | PM 110 | 7, 33 |
| Payne | Michael A | BikeHouston | W 628 | 17, 18, 32 |
| Pedigo | Joseph | | W 567 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Penton | Misha | | W 661 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 E390 |
| Peruchini | Jerry | Mayor Pro-Tem Ed Gonzalez | E 248 | 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 17, 33, 39 |
| Pieszchala | Tim | | E 236 | 32, 47 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Piette | Dan | | E 169 | 34 |
| Piette | Dan | | PM 89 | 34 |
| Pitauiak | Erik | | PM 97 | 13, 33, 42, 47 |
| Pohl | Bob | | W 572 | 33 |
| Poplaski | Timothy | | W 557 | 3, 29 |
| Preston | Stephen | Northline Commons, LLC | W 632 | 7, 16 |
| Preston | Stephen | Northline Commons, LLC | E 244 | 6, 7, 13, 16, 39 |
| Proctor | Rob | | E 204 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Public | Joe Q. | | W 514 | 2 |
| Radtke | Nathan | | W 449 | 29, 34 |
| Ragsdale | Jeffrey | | W 456 | 1, 3 |
| Raimond | Randy | | E 246 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Ramirez | Patricia | Shave Barber | W 551 | 7, 39 |
| Ramirez | Anartaeo | | PM 131 | 39 |
| Rao-Delgado | Toni | | W 457 | 29 |
| Rathke | Christina | | W 522 | 4, 17, 42 |
| Reid | Jared | | W 578 | 29 |
| Reiser | Andrew | | W 520 | 29 |
| Requena | Maria G. | | PM 68 | 8 |
| Reyes | Frumencio | Greater Northside Management District | E 194 | 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18, 26, 33, 43, 47 |
| Reyes | Frumencio | Greater Northside Management District | M 49 | 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18, 26, 33, 43, 47 |
| Reyes/GNMD | Frumencio | Greater Northside Management | W 681 | 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18, 26, 33, |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| | | District | | 43, 47 |
| Reyna | Rebecca | | E 181 | 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 33, 34, 39 |
| Richards | Mike | Shamrock Machinery Company | E 163 | 7, 16, 33 |
| Richter | Coyia | | W 595 | 29 |
| Rigdon | Sarah | | W 455 | 29 |
| Riojas | Ryan | | W 502 | 34 |
| Robinson | Erica | | W 474 | 31 |
| Robinson | Clay | | W 486 | 29 |
| Robison | Ann | Montrose center | PM 103 | 3, 5 |
| Rodewald | Allan | | W 649 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Roe | Janet | | E 222 | 4, 5, 43 |
| Roe | Janet | | E 276 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Roque | Jonathan | | E 177 | 7, 38, 39, 42, 47 |
| Rowland | K | | W 471 | 4, 29, 39, 42, 47 |
| Rubio | Tony | | W 682 | 33 |
| Rubio | Antonio | | PM 105 | 33, 47 |
| Ruiz | Armando | | W 496 | 16, 31 |
| Ruple | Reid | | W 443 | 11 |
| Ruple | Reid | | W 601 | 11, 38 |
| Rutledge | Patrick W. | Friends of Woodland Park, Inc. | W 621 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Rutledge | Pat | Friends of Woodland Park, Inc. | E 205 | 6, 10, 14, 17, 18, 39, 47 |
| Rutledge | Pat | Friends of Woodland Park, Inc. | E 272 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Salazar | Alberto | | E 162 | 3 |
| Schmitt | Tracie L | | W 539 | 29 |
| Schultz-Ormond | Patricia | | W 481 | 4, 33, 47 |
| Schwaller | Sarah | | E 172 | 3 |
| Schwark | Darryl | | W 596 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Self | Ronnie | | W 528 | 8, 13, 14, 29, 39, 47 |
| Self | Ronnie | | W 662 | 14, 18, 26, 43, 47 |
| Self | Ronnie | | E 178 | 8, 13, 14, 29, 39, 47 |
| Sengvong | Linda | | W 577 | 29 |
| Sevilla | Jessica | | W 491 | 6, 16 |
| Seyer | Will | | W 488 | 14, 17, 29, 39, 47 |
| Shepard | Tom | | W 643 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Shepard | Tom | | PM 78 | 39 |
| Shephard | Chris | | W 692 | 10, 13 |
| Shumway | L Dawn | | W 665 | 29 |
| Shumway | Dawn | | E 231 | 29 |
| Sigler | Georgianne | | W 603 | 29 |
| Silcocks | Kristina | Carl B. Zucker ETB, LLC | E 215 | 6, 7, 10, 16, 40 |
| Silhavy | Justin | | W 494 | 1, 13, 39, 47 |
| Slotboom | Oscar | | W 561 | 1, 11, 17, 29, 33, 38, 39, 42, 44, 47 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Slotboom | Oscar | | E 186 | 1, 11, 17, 29, 33, 38, 39, 42, 44, 47 |
| Slotboom | Oscar | | E 187 | 1, 11, 17, 29, 33, 38, 39, 42, 44, 47 |
| Slotboom | Oscar | | M 50 | 1, 11, 17, 29, 33, 38, 39, 42, 44, 47 |
| Slotboom | Oscar | | PM 74 | 11, 38, 42, 44 |
| Smith | Donald | | W 598 | 47 |
| Smith | Frances | | E 247 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Smith, Jr. | Edgar | | PM 83 | 29 |
| Snider | Susan | | E 250 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Snider | Susan | | E 251 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Snyder | Paula | | E 284 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| St. Michael | Sue | | W 448 | 2 |
| Stephenson | Chad | | W 591 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Sternfels | Melissa | | E 159 | 4, 5, 8, 17, 33, 39 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Strawn | Sabrina | | E 209 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Streckfuss | Andrew | | W 469 | 3 |
| Sutter | Ronald | | W 445 | 8, 9, 26, 34, 37, 47 |
| Sutton | Alex | North Houston Association | M 47 | 47 |
| Tate | William | | E 241 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Tattersall | Ted | | W 513 | 2, 3, 16 |
| Tello | Lynnette O. | | PM 140 | 6 |
| Tello | Michael | | PM 141 | 6 |
| Tesar | Debbie | | E 210 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Thomas | Gary | H-GAC | E 190 | 3, 7, 11, 14, 18, 33, 38, 39, 42 |
| Thornsen | Jesse | | W 687 | 5, 7, 13, 17, 18, 26, 39 |
| Tollett | JoAnn | | E 153 | 29 |
| Touchstone | Kelli | | W 590 | 29 |
| Trevino | Deyadira | | E 249 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Trevino | Deyadira | | E 266 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| | | | | 43, 44, 47 |
| Trevino | Robert | METRO | E 290 | 46 |
| Trout | Emily | | E 175 | 4, 5, 8, 17, 33, 39 |
| Trout | Emily | | E 256 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Valliant | Darlene | | E 232 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| VanElswyk | Abram | | E 161 | 11, 33, 38, 39, 42, 47 |
| Verrett | Len | | W 560 | 47 |
| Vice | Nathaniel | | W 517 | 29 |
| Villaescusa | Julie | | W 592 | 3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 29, 39, 42, 47 |
| Virden | John | | PM 124 | 47 |
| Walker | Caroline | | W 462 | 29 |
| Wallace | Connie | | E 168 | 29 |
| Watson | Tim | | W 544 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Webb | Jarret | | PM 96 | 4, 33, 43 |
| Weissgerber | Hans | Royal Bavaria Company | W 553 | 42, 47 |
| Welch | Mark | | E 173 | 10 |
| Weston | Jim | I-45 Coalition | E 224 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Weston | Jim | I-45 Coalition | E 225 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Weston | Jim | | E 242 | 33, 39 |
| White | Ron | | W 582 | 29 |
| Whitsett | Jeff | | W 470 | 29 |
| Whitsett | Jeff | | W 573 | 29 |
| Whitsett | Jeff | | W 575 | 18 |
| Whitten | Jill | | E 287 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Wilborn | Brice | | E 199 | 7, 17, 29, 43 |
| Wilburn | Daniel | | M 51 | 3, 29 |
| Williams | LaVerne A. | | W 519 | 29 |
| Williams | Julie | | E 219 | 4, 18, 39 |
| Williams | Russell | | PM 69 | 1, 47 |
| Wolf | Bill | | W 506 | 47 |
| Woods | Steven Paul | | W 546 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Woods | Kimberly Ann | | W 547 | 8, 24, 33, 39 |
| Woods | Kimberly Ann | | PM 93 | 39 |
| Woods | Dr. Steven Paul | | PM 94 | 39 |
| Woodson | Norman | | W 624 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| Wurzbach | A | | W 597 | 29 |
| Wylie | Matthew | | W 645 | 8, 33, 39 |
| Wylie | Matthew G. | | E 164 | 4, 5, 33, 39 |
| Wylie | Matthew G. | | M 42 | 4, 5, 33, 39 |
| Yong | Alice | | W 516 | 29 |
| Yong | Emily | | W 521 | 29 |

| Key to Responses to Comments<br>North Houston Highway Improvement Project - Public Meeting 4<br>Comment Codes: E-Emailed, M-Mailed, W-Website, PM-Public Meeting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Last Name** | **First Name** | **Affiliation** | **Comment Code** | **Response** |
| Zacarias | Felix | | W 537 | 8 |
| Zacarias | Felix | | W 538 | 8 |
| Zak | Greg | Dixon Motors | M 40 | 7 |
| Zieben | Lee | | E 189 | 8, 13 |
| Zievert | Calvin | | W 668 | 32, 33, 39, 47 |
| Zucker | Brad | Business owner | PM 129 | 6, 7 |
| | Isaiah | | W 460 | 17 |
| | Abby | | W 499 | 31 |
| | Abby | | W 500 | 47 |
| | Martin | | W 518 | 14, 29 |
| | Robert | | W 565 | 4, 10, 29 |
| | Colin | | W 646 | 29 |
| | Nicola | | W 696 | 8, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 33, 39, 43 |
| | Thomas | | E 166 | 1, 3, 18, 34, 38, 47 |
| No name provided | | | E 237 | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 22, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47 |
| No name provided | | | PM 80 | 25 |
| No name provided | | | PM 118 | 29 |
| No name provided | | | PM 136 | 29 |
| No name provided | | | PM 144 | 3, 18, 32 |
| No name provided | | | PM 145 | 3, 18, 32 |
| | Alfonzo | | PM 147 | 33, 39 |