

Appendix G
Record of Comments Received and Responses

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
	City of Wilmer							
1	City Officials	City of Wilmer	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Wilmer has the largest amount of developable land in the Dallas Inland Port area. Connecting I-35E and I-45 increases development opportunity for industrial, retail, and residential.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
2	City Officials	City of Wilmer	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Improving major thoroughfares like Pleasant Run Road and Beltline Road.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
3	City Officials	City of Wilmer		The population is projected to increase drastically.	11/5/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
4	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	Western part of Wilmer needs north/south artery connecting Loop 9 to Pleasant Run Road west of I-45. Also there needs to be a north/south on the east side of I-45 connecting Loop 9 to Beltline Road.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
5	City Officials	City of Wilmer		Residential properties exist and are planned south of Belt Line Road on the east side of I-45.	11/4/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
6	City Officials	City of Wilmer	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	Refer to NCTCOG Infrastructure study and Wilmer Comprehensive Plan.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
7	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	Currently adequate but need continuous review.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
8	City Officials	City of Wilmer		The 2030 Land Use Plan will provide useful information – City of Wilmer will provide this Plan.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
9	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	No.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
10	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Other than your community’s comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	Refer to NCTCOG study.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
11	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	City growth creates new roads and need for improving existing network. Most of existing is old and in need of major repair.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
12	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Yes, refer to Mike Rader and major landowners on west side of I-45.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
13	City Officials	City of Wilmer		Mike Radar is one of the largest (if not the largest) landowner since the 1980s – he owns Sun Bridge Business Park, Arch Chemicals on Pleasant Road (east side).	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
14	City Officials	City of Wilmer		City wants to make sure that Loop 9 provides frontage road with access on both sides of Loop 9 that allow for highest level of development and that connection at I-45 provides development on all four corners.	11/7/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
15	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	There is a cemetery on the east side of I-45 and Loop 9 alignment appears to border the south boundary of the cemetery. This is not desired as it limits economic development.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	The cemetery on the east side of I-45 and Loop 9 alignment will continue to be taken into consideration during the NEPA-design stage of the project.
16	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	There are high voltage transmission lines but not sure if they impact the proposed ROW.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
17	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	No.	11/5/2012	City of Wilmer	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
18	City Officials	City of Wilmer	Additional comments	None.				Comment Acknowledged.
	City of Seagoville							
19	City Officials	City of Seagoville	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	All the above. The main goal of this community is to provide residents a quick/safe route to and from jobs. Particularly, the community needs capacity improvements on Highway 175.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
20	City Officials	City of Seagoville	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	All the above. The main goal of this community is to provide residents a quick/safe route to and from jobs. Particularly, the community needs capacity improvements on Highway 175.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
21	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	No. The City is in the process of renovating the old downtown.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
22	City Officials	City of Seagoville	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	There are no proposed roadway improvements in the Loop 9 study area.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
23	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	Yes.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
24	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	No.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
25	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	No.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
26	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	The main goal of this community is to provide residents a quick/safe route to and from jobs. Particularly, the community needs capacity improvements on Highway 175.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
27	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Wal-mart, ACE (planned construction in front of Wal-Mart), a proposed new school to be constructed (approximately 2 ½ miles west-northwest near East Simonds Road), a proposed development (retail / residential) along existing Malloy Bridge Road between Highway 175 and I-20 near crossing of East Fork Trinity tributary.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
28	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	Church on Malloy Bridge Road (Rock Church) and another church on Kaufman and Malloy Bridge Road.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	The proposed corridor options do not impact Rock Church or the church on Kaufman and Malloy Bridge Road. An option along Malloy Bridge Road may be considered in the future, but will not be considered as part of the 2013 Corridor/Feasibility Study.
29	City Officials	City of Seagoville		Do not impact Wal-mart.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	The proposed corridor options do not impact Wal-mart. However, alignment and interchange design has not yet begun. The Wal-mart will continue to be taken into consideration during the NEPA-design stage of the project.
30	City Officials	City of Seagoville		There are Historic Churches in the area that need to be avoided.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
31	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	No.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
32	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	Yes, there is a cemetery at Highway 175 that should be protected as well as John Bunker Sands Wetland Area.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	The Corridor/Feasibility Study will take into consideration the request to avoid the cemetery at Highway 175. The current corridor options avoid John Bunker Sands Wetland Center. However, alignment and interchange design has not yet begun. The cemetery and John Bunker Sands Wetland Center will continue to be taken into consideration during the NEPA-design stage of the project.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
33	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	No problems were voiced regarding the DEIS alignment location with the 300- to 350-foot shown in the exhibit (provided in the meeting today).	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
34	City Officials	City of Seagoville	Additional comments	Discussions regarding improving Malloy Bridge Road as part of the Loop 9 improvements and have Malloy Bridge Road widened to a six-lane section through town until the proposed Loop 9 will be constructed in the future.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
35	City Officials	City of Seagoville		Since most of the proposed Loop 9 alignment and adjacent properties is within floodplain and wetland areas, the clearance process and possible construction of Loop 9 could be 20 years away. In the interim, the immediate community need is to add a lane on both sides of existing US 175 from Seagoville to I-635.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
36	City Officials	City of Seagoville		The City is in favor of the current concept configuration – a previous version of the alignment was impacting Wal-Mart located at the corner of US 175 and Malloy Bridge Road) and the city would not support any alternative that would impact Wal-Mart.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	The proposed corridor options do not impact Wal-mart. However, alignment and interchange design has not yet begun. The Wal-mart will continue to be taken into consideration during the NEPA-design stage of the project.
37	City Officials	City of Seagoville		The City prefers the revised proposed typical section with narrow, barrier separated mainlanes – this will help reduce impacts through town. Would like to be provided a copy of the revised barrier separated typical section.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Three regional Task Force meetings are scheduled for February. The City of Seagoville has been invited to all 3 meeting. Proposed typical sections will be presented at all 3 meetings.
38	City Officials	City of Seagoville		There is a major need for transportation improvement in the City – quality of life is limited with the city’s capability of getting goods and services in and out of the City hampered by traffic congestions. Widening US 175 would improve quality of life and reduce commuters travel time.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
39	City Officials	City of Seagoville		With regard to current traffic issues in and around Seagoville, heavy trucks use Malloy Bridge Road as a short cut route to travel between I-45 and I-20.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
40	City Officials	City of Seagoville		Since Seagoville is in a non-attainment area, the widening of US 175 should be a priority.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
41	City Officials	City of Seagoville		The city of Seagoville is mainly a blue-collar community with significant percentage commutes to Dallas for work.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
42	City Officials	City of Seagoville		The growth of the City is wide spread and in all directions.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
43	City Officials	City of Seagoville		The City identified Wal-Mart, ACE Hardware (planned to be constructed in front of Wal-Mart), a proposed new school to be constructed (east of Seagoville Road and north of E. Simonde Road), a proposed development (retail / residential) along existing Malloy Bridge Road between US 175 and I 20 to be the additional major stakeholders along the proposed Loop 9 corridor.	11/6/2012	Interview	Environmental	The proposed corridor options do not impact Wal-Mart, ACE Hardware (planned to be constructed in front of Wal-Mart), a proposed new school to be constructed (east of Seagoville Road and north of E. Simonde Road). However, alignment and interchange design has not yet begun. The Wal-mart will continue to be taken into consideration during the NEPA-design stage of the project.
	City of Ferris							
44	City Officials	City of Ferris	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Our primary goals for Loop 9 are two fold: primarily, we see it as a way to help develop the northern part of our city from an economic development standpoint. Loop 9 will bring increased traffic through the area and we see the opportunity for major commercial development to occur along the route if it is routed correctly. We would be curious to discuss frontage roads as well as on ramps and exits from Loop 9 and where they might be located.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
45	City Officials	City of Ferris		The second objective is connectivity. Loop 9 will make Ferris more accessible due to the proximity of the road to our city and the various connections to other roads.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
46	City Officials	City of Ferris	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	The immediate need that Loop 9 will solve for us will be to take major truck traffic out of our downtown area. Currently we have a lot of FM 664 truck traffic that winds through a very narrow road in our downtown, being forced to stop at stop signs and make tight turns on surface streets as they navigate to and from I-45 and to and from Waste Management on the north side of the city. Loop 9 will give them a way to directly connect to I-45 on a high speed connection and to access Waste Management easily. Also, we expect Loop 9 to reduce the number of accidents that occur each year on FM 664. FM 664 is used extensively by northern Ellis County residents who prefer driving on I-45.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
47	City Officials	City of Ferris	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	We are currently working with other local cities on a redesign/reroute of FM 664. In Ferris, this would create southern bypass of FM 664.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
48	City Officials	City of Ferris		Ferris is working with Red Oak and Ovilla on the proposed FM 664 project. HDR is contracted for this work. There is a Public Meeting for FM 664 scheduled on December 11, 2012 from 5:00 – 7:00 at Red Oak City Hall.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
49	City Officials	City of Ferris	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	NA	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
50	City Officials	City of Ferris	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	This year we have funded a new Comprehensive Plan study. We have never formally adopted a Comprehensive Plan, although we have several of the pieces of a Comprehensive Plan. Part of that process will involve updating land use controls and zoning. Our subdivision regulations were modified within the last five years and we feel that they are currently adequate.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
51	City Officials	City of Ferris		There is a RFQ out to conduct a Comprehensive Plan. This work is anticipated to start in January and last 8-12 months. The last Comprehensive Plan was adopted 5-6 years ago. There are a lot of changes coming with this new Comprehensive Plan.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
52	City Officials	City of Ferris	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	See above. Our zoning and land development regulations are all being re-evaluated as part of our Comprehensive Plan study, which will be initiated in January.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
53	City Officials	City of Ferris	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	We are currently working with a developer who owns land that is just outside our city limits. They are proposing developing their land utilizing a Fresh Water Supply District. This will not be in the City Limits, but it will be a significant development which projects adding approximately 3,000 single family residences over a 22 year period.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
54	City Officials	City of Ferris	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	No.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
55	City Officials	City of Ferris		There is high truck traffic thru downtown Ferris (FM 664) which is dangerous.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
56	City Officials	City of Ferris	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Depending on the alignment, Waste Management might need to be consulted. They are currently undergoing an expansion permit that pushes parts of the landfill slightly north.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	A meeting with Waste Management was held late 2013 to discuss potential impacts to the landfill.
57	City Officials	City of Ferris		Ray Wallace owns most of the property east of I-45. Kenneth Johnson owns the area east of Ferris Rd. and property at the I-45 interchange. John Hall owns property along Malloy Bridge Road.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. An Open House is scheduled for Spring 2013. The three property owners will be included on the mailing list.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
58	City Officials	City of Ferris		Waste Management property is adjacent to the ROW.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	A meeting with Waste Management was held late 2013 to discuss potential impacts to the landfill.
59	City Officials	City of Ferris		There is a permit application to expand the landfill.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
60	City Officials	City of Ferris	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	Not to our knowledge.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
61	City Officials	City of Ferris		Trinity River Authority is considering expansion to the south. They are proposing surge ponds south of current alignment.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	The project team has met with Trinity River Authority. They indicated that they have future plans to expand south. The corridor options are north of the Trinity River Authority.
62	City Officials	City of Ferris	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	Potentially the Trinity River Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
63	City Officials	City of Ferris		There is an existing 30" wastewater line following Tenmile Creek.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
64	City Officials	City of Ferris	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	No.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
65	City Officials	City of Ferris		Would prefer if the alignment crossed Tenmile Creek as few times as possible. Right now the proposed alignment crosses Tenmile Creek two or three times.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	The large power lines existing north of the DEIS Alternative limit the ability to shift north. Skyline Landfill, located south of the DEIS Alternative limits the ability to shift south at I-45. Additionally, a bridge is proposed at the I-45 interchange location to so minimize impacts to floodplain, Tenmile Creek and several other smaller streams. Stream impacts will be mitigation according to state, federal and local standards. This analysis will be conducted during the NEPA process.
66	City Officials	City of Ferris	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	No.	11/7/2012	City of Ferris	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
67	City Officials	City of Ferris		We are happy with the current alignment as proposed.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
68	City Officials	City of Ferris	Additional comments	There is good potential for development east of I-45.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
69	City Officials	City of Ferris		I-45 is not good for development b/c floodplains at this intersection – west of I-45 to Ferris Rd.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
70	City Officials	City of Ferris		Prefer at-grade frontage roads, particularly at I-45 and Ferris Road intersections to provide major access points to and from Ferris.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
71	City Officials	City of Ferris		Concerns were voiced about the need for access points to Ferris Road.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
72	City Officials	City of Ferris		Currently there is high truck traffic volume using I-20 to access I-45. The proposed Loop 9 route to I-45 will provide a better E/W truck route than I-20.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
73	City Officials	City of Ferris		The proposed route will provide a better route for trucks coming to and from the landfill which currently use downtown as a main thoroughfare.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
74	City Officials	City of Ferris		There is a Feasibility Study conducted for FM 664 approximately 1 year old that was done in conjunction with Red Oak and Ovilla.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
75	City Officials	City of Ferris		The City prefers the revised interchange concept at I-45 due to a reduced right-of-way impact that will attract potential developments at the interchange.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
76	City Officials	City of Ferris		The City would like to know proposed access locations early in the process.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
								clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
77	City Officials	City of Ferris		The City prefers a three-level interchange concept with a frontage road box at I-45.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
78	City Officials	City of Ferris		There is an existing Sanitary Sewer Line (size could be a 30" but not sure) along Tenmile Creek Road that goes to the Trinity Wastewater Treatment facility.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
79	City Officials	City of Ferris		The City would like to be provided with the entire alignment on an Aerial.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Three regional Task Force meetings are scheduled for February. The City of Ferris has been invited to all 3 meetings. The corridor shift options will be presented at all three meetings on an aerial.
	City of Combine							
80	City Officials	City of Combine	What is your community's goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Economic development and possibly connectivity, depending on where it goes. This is a bedroom community and 75% of residents head north to work, so access to US 175 is essential.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
81	City Officials	City of Combine	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Connection to US 175. Also need to straighten FM 1389 b/c where FM 1389 curves, it is very dangerous.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
82	City Officials	City of Combine	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	No. No money for improvements. No development plans. There is only about \$25K/year budget available to help with maintenance.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
83	City Officials	City of Combine	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	None. See #3.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
84	City Officials	City of Combine	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	No. Combine has a zoning plan from 1988 but this needs to be re-evaluated. City requires residences to be on one-acre lots which keeps the city from growing.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
85	City Officials	City of Combine	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	Not at this time.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
86	City Officials	City of Combine	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	Water lines are being added south of the town and south of the current concept alignment near Haines Road and Jimmy Lane.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
87	City Officials	City of Combine	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Current alignment isolates Combine because it primarily passes through Seagoville. Also the current concept alignment would isolate Combine if access road were not provided.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
88	City Officials	City of Combine	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Mickey Koller – owns a majority of Koller properties. Also Jerold (Jerry) Koller. You may want to talk with Seagoville airport.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. An Open House is scheduled for Spring 2013. The property owner and airport manager will be included on the mailing list.
89	City Officials	City of Combine	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	Private airport. John Bunker Sands Wetland Center off Martin Lane used for educational purposes. Also see #9.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	The proposed corridor options do not impact John Bunker Sands Wetland Center or the private airport. However, alignment and interchange design has not yet begun. The John Bunker Sands Wetland Center and the private airport will continue to be taken into consideration during the design stage of the project.
90	City Officials	City of Combine	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	Major power lines. A 30-inch high-pressure gas line. A substation is located near FM 1389 and the US 175 intersection.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
91	City Officials	City of Combine	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	Pleasant Grove Cemetery. Raines Hall Cemetery on Combine Road next to the airport. John Bunker Sands Wetland Center off Martin Lane used for educational purposes.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	The proposed corridor options do not impact Pleasant Grove Cemetery, Raines Hall Cemetery on Combine Road next to the airport, or John Bunker Sands Wetland Center. However, alignment and interchange design has not yet begun. The Pleasant Grove Cemetery, Raines Hall Cemetery on Combine Road next to the airport and John Bunker Sands Wetland Center will continue to be taken into consideration during the design stage of the project.
92	City Officials	City of Combine	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	Shift south to follow city limits; however, since the area that would be shifted south further into Combine is floodplain, there may not be any benefit to a shift south. Access needs to be on a state-maintained road (preferably FM 1389).	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	West of Kaufman Street, the Corridor Shift Option shifts slightly south further into Combine; however, to provide additional separation from E. Fork Trinity River and avoid two streams and the Rock Church, the Shift Option is proposed to shift slightly away from Combine.
93	City Officials	City of Combine	Additional comments	It was noted that most of the alignment near Combine is located in a floodplain. If the alignment passes through floodplain and no development can occur, then Combine is indifferent to the placement of the alignment.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
94	City Officials	City of Combine		The most important access points for the City of Combine are FM 1389 and Bilindsay Road. First and foremost they request access at FM 1389.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been analyzed, the phasing of the project will occur which will include identifying access areas for Loop 9. Once the traffic modeling has been analyzed, the project team will discuss access locations with the City of Combine.
95	City Officials	City of Combine		Seagoville Airport is located near intersection of FM 1389 and Combine Road. Small, private airport owned by George Tenell.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Currently the proposed corridor options do not impact the Seagoville Airport; however, the limits of construction have not been finalized.
	City of Cedar Hill							
96	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Provide needed east / west connectivity for existing residents and businesses.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
97	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Provide access to areas with limited access, opening new land for development.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
98	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Provide multimodal transportation connections across Hwy 67 including bike / ped options and context sensitive design solutions.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
99	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Enhance economic development activity in the southern and southeastern portions of the city.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
100	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Hike and bike trail to be constructed soon along Lake Ridge Parkway.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
101	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Access and connectivity is of prime concern at this point in time.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been analyzed, the phasing of the project will occur which will include identifying access areas for Loop 9. Once the traffic modeling has been analyzed, the project team will discuss access locations with the City of Cedar Hill.
102	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Further, alternate transportation routes are needed to offset congestions and provide a major interstate connection needed for safe traffic flow and enhanced traffic patterns.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
103	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	Loop-9’s crossing of the RR track is planned as a future TOD. Access to this area will be paramount. No specific plans have been prepared yet.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been analyzed, the phasing of the project will occur which will include identifying access areas for Loop 9. Once the traffic modeling has been analyzed, the project team will discuss access locations with the City of Cedar Hill.
104	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Loop 9 will provide an important alternate transportation opportunity for industrial traffic originating east of the BNSF tracks.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
105	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Additionally, in general, it will enable industrial traffic to travel east bound without going north to I-20. This is important given that the City’s industrial areas are on the southern side.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
106	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		The City recently approved a comprehensive trails and bikeway plan which has major core trails along the BNSF Railroad, and Lake Ridge Parkway. Loop 9 should enhance these opportunities along desired routes. The BNSF Railroad will probably be both cargo and transit in the future.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
107	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	Nothing is programmed in this area at this time.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
108	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Nothing is planned for the next 5 years, but improvements are planned beyond 5 years.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
109	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	The current Comprehensive Plan recommends an alignment and land uses in the area. A change in the nature of Loop-9 will likely necessitate changes in the Comp Plan.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
110	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	Multimodal transportation options and streetscape alternatives recently approved by the City as part of the Park Master Plan need to be considered.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
111	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	Major Update of the City's Parks and Trails Plan adopted in 2012.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
112	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		City Center plan currently in process – between Pleasant Run and Tidwell, approximately 3.5 miles north of the proposed alignment.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
113	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	The southern sector of Cedar Hill has very limited access which Loop-9 is expected to remedy.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
114	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Cedar Hill has very limited east/west connections which Loop-9 is expected to remedy.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
115	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Area residents, business leaders, property owners and the general population.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
116	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	The alignment of the roadway should strongly consider the impact on existing, established neighborhoods in an attempt to minimize any adverse impacts on them.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	The Corridor/Feasibility Study is taking into consideration established neighborhoods. One Corridor Shift Option has been proposed partly to minimize impacts to Bear Creek subdivision.
117	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Bear Creek neighborhood already has some dedicated ROW for Loop 9.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
118	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		In addition, the alignment should be conducive to future commercial/local retail developments being provided at the outermost city limits rather than in areas that bisect neighborhoods.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
119	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	TV broadcast tower in Ellis County west of Tar Road – in between proposed north and south alignments	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	A Corridor Shift Option has been suggested which will avoid the TV broadcast tower.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
120	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		There is an existing 36” gas line which potentially may play a role in the alignment study and analysis.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
121	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		A gas pumping station is present in the NW quadrant of the Lake Ridge Parkway and US 67 intersection.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
122	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	The southeast quadrant of Cedar Hill is the location where a future community park (or two) will be developed.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	The proposed Corridor Options do not impact the parcel where the future community park will be developed.
123	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		In addition, there are several future neighborhood parks, open space, and regional detention/retention opportunities that need to be identified and considered	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
124	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	Must provide access to/from Lake Ridge Parkway and US 67.	11/7/2012	City of Cedar Hill	Environmental	A Corridor Shift Option has been suggested which will tie in to Lake Ridge Parkway.
125	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Additional comments	Cedar Hill supports the Loop 9 Project.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
126	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	US 67 Interchange	The city indicated concern that the proposed Loop9/US 67 interchange is close to the existing US 67/Lake Ridge Parkway intersection.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
127	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Major planning initiatives occurring around Lake Ridge Parkway.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
128	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Suggested Loop 9 connect to US 67 at Lake Ridge Parkway.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	A Corridor Shift Option has been suggested which will tie in to Lake Ridge Parkway.
129	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Lake Ridge Parkway will be improved with hike and bike trail, lights and landscaping.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
130	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		If Loop 9 connected at Lake Ridge Parkway, study would need to be done to consider impacts to the residential areas off of Lake Ridge Parkway.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
131	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		Terminating the proposed Loop 9 at US 67 will create congestion problems for the City of Cedar Hill.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Based on updated traffic projections, it is anticipated that the proposed project would not significantly increase congestion in this location.
132	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		The TV tower located east of US 67 is not impacted.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	A Corridor Shift Option has been suggested which will avoid the TV broadcast tower.
133	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill		The City would like to see a Complete Streets concept utilized during the Loop 9 design.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	The current proposed typical section, as presented at the Regional Task Force meetings in February 2013 incorporate the Complete Streets concept design.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
134	Mayor	City of Cedar Hill	Loss of US 287 Connection	Mayor requested that Loop 9 study limits extend south along US 67 to US 287 – it is unlikely the existing US 287/US 67 interchange could handle the additional traffic expected once Loop 9 is completed. In addition, US 67 does not have the capacity to handle the additional future traffic between Loop 9 and US 287.	11/7/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. This Corridor/Feasibility Study is only studying limits from US 67 to I-20.
	Kaufman County							
135	County Officials	Kaufman County	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Connectivity	11/8/2012	Kaufman County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
136	County Officials	Kaufman County		Kaufman County is in favor of the proposed Loop 9 project.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
137	County Officials	Kaufman County	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Congestion relief.	11/8/2012	Kaufman County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
138	County Officials	Kaufman County		Bridge over Highway 175 at FM 1895.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
139	County Officials	Kaufman County	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	No.	11/8/2012	Kaufman County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
140	County Officials	Kaufman County	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	None.	11/8/2012	Kaufman County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
141	County Officials	Kaufman County	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	No. An engineering firm will be hired to conduct a Comprehensive Plan.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
142	County Officials	Kaufman County	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	No.	11/8/2012	Kaufman County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
143	County Officials	Kaufman County	Other than your community’s comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	No.	11/8/2012	Kaufman County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
144	County Officials	Kaufman County	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Yes, in the process of utilizing a consultant to determine needs.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
145	County Officials	Kaufman County	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	EDC and City of Combine Council.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
146	County Officials	Kaufman County	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	No.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
147	County Officials	Kaufman County	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	No.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
148	County Officials	Kaufman County	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	Wetlands.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
149	County Officials	Kaufman County	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	No.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
150	County Officials	Kaufman County	Additional comments	A question was asked regarding how Loop 9 would cross several streams.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Efforts to minimize impacts at stream crossings are being considered during the Corridor/Feasibility Study.
151	County Officials	Kaufman County		A concern was presented regarding if adequate drainage facilities would be provided for the proposed Loop 9 project, especially in the area of Combine where there would be high potential for flooding.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	
152	Commissioner Manning	Kaufman County		Commissioner Tom Manning noted that he had seen a couple velvet tail rattlesnakes (state-threatened timber canebrake) in the area.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. A detailed threatened and endangered species study would be conducted as part of the NEPA process. During that time, environmental specialist may contact Mr. Manning to identify specific areas where the snakes were seen and when. This information will help to assess whether the project would impact the areas where the snakes have been sighted.
153	County Officials	Kaufman County		It was mentioned that the Economic Development Directors of Crandall and Forney could provide information about surrounding growth.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
154	County Officials	Kaufman County		The entrance to John Bunker Sands Wetlands Center should be maintained.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	The current corridor options avoid John Bunker Sands Wetland Center. However, alignment and interchange design has not yet begun. The cemetery and John Bunker Sands Wetland Center will continue to be taken into consideration during the NEPA-design stage of the project.
155	Judge Wood	Kaufman County		The County Judge stated that this project is a plus for Kaufman County – the project can’t do anything but help the county.	11/8/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
	City of Ovilla							
156	County Officials	City of Ovilla	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Connectivity with an emphasis on relieving the stress on existing roads are only concern is ease of access so that commuters are neither isolated from or dumped on our roads.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
157	County Officials	City of Ovilla		The City of Ovilla prefers existing Westmoreland Road bridge be widened. Also the existing intersection of Westmoreland Road with FM 664/Ovilla Road should be improved for safety and efficiency.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
158	County Officials	City of Ovilla	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Congestion relief on Hwy 664.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
159	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Fm 664/Ovilla Rd has several sharp curves and as such it is slow and congested most of the time.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
160	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	Expansion of Hwy 664 and realignment of Hwy 664 Westmoreland Rd. intersection.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
161	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Expansion of FM 664/Ovilla Road is being improved to a 6-lane facility.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
162	County Officials	City of Ovilla	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	Relocation of utilities in FM 664/Ovilla Road ROW.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
163	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	Yes.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
164	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	The 3 parcels that front Bear Creek are to be rezoned industrial.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
165	County Officials	City of Ovilla		At Bear Creek Road and the proposed alignment intersection, no developers on board.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
166	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	None in house.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
167	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	No.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
168	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Utilities.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
169	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	No.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
170	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	Our 30" Water Line from Dallas Water Utilities crosses the proposed ROW at Duncanville Rd.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
171	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Our 18" sewer line at Cockrell Hill North/South, and 12" water line at Cockrell Hill and Bear Creek North/South.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
172	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	No.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
173	County Officials	City of Ovilla		The City has a vision to construct a public park adjacent to FM 664/Ovilla Road.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
174	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	The proposed location along Bear Creek has been approved any alternatives would have to be discussed.	11/9/2012	City of Ovilla	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
175	County Officials	City of Ovilla	Additional comments	Ovilla supports the Loop 9 Project.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
176	County Officials	City of Ovilla		FM/664 Ovilla Road currently has a large volume of truck traffic and the proposed Loop 9 would help to reduce truck traffic on FM 664/Ovilla Road. Expressed concern that a segment of the alignment that goes through the flood plain might potentially take longer to secure environmental clearance for the project. Could help to reduce truck traffic on FM 664/Ovilla Road.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
177	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Expressed concern that a segment of the alignment that goes through the flood plain might potentially take longer to secure environmental clearance for the project.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	The time it takes to secure environmental clearance will be analyzed as part of the program of projects which will be a result of the Corridor/Feasibility Study.
178	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Suggested as much of the work done for the DEIS be used again to expedite the project, going forward.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	The information obtained during the DEIS is currently being used to analyze impacts of corridor options.
179	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Prefers the new concept for proposed Loop 9 interchange with I-35E as shown in the presentation.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
180	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Prefers Westmoreland to be the major access point from and to the proposed Loop 9 to the City of Ovilla.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
181	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Prefers to have an at grade intersections at Cockrell Hill Road and the proposed Loop 9 frontage Roads with a grade separation at the proposed Loop 9.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
182	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Does not want the alignment be pushed south in order to provide interchange at Ovilla Road.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The Duncanville Rd to Westmoreland Rd Shift Option shift slightly south towards Ovilla in order to minimize impacts to a future commercial property at the corner of Bear Creek Rd and Cockrell Hill Rd.
183	County Officials	City of Ovilla		Prefers the alignment to be at the same location as it was in the DEIS through Ovilla - The City worked closely with TxDOT during the DEIS process and concurred with the alignment through Ovilla.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. All proposed Corridor Shift Options proposed are a direct result of the local official interviews and/or to reduce environmental impacts of the project. Currently there are 6 proposed shifts (as shown at the February 2013 Regional Task Force Meetings) which are minor.
184	County Officials	City of Ovilla		If revisions to the alignment will be warranted at Cockrell Hill Road, the City's preference will be to shift the alignment further north of the location shown in the exhibit presented at the meeting.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The Duncanville Rd to Westmoreland Rd Shift Option shift slightly south towards Ovilla in order to minimize impacts to a future commercial property at the corner of Bear Creek Rd and Cockrell Hill Rd. However, the shift options are still under consideration as comments from the Regional Task Force meetings continue to be analyzed.
	Dallas County							
185	County Officials	Dallas County	What is your community's goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Serving the existing communities for economic development.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
186	County Officials	Dallas County		Economic Development and Connectivity.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
187	County Officials	Dallas County	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	East – west connections/access to the major interstates.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
188	County Officials	Dallas County		Connection to major interstate and Economic Development.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
189	County Officials	Dallas County	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	Yes, proposed waterline in the planning stages – to Wilmer and Hutchins.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
190	County Officials	Dallas County		From US 67 to I-35E Segment - NA	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
191	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-35E to I-45 Segment - The area of the Inland Port. Also some water line infrastructure improvements will be needed; especially in the area of Hutchins and Wilmer. Dallas County is in the process of evaluating infrastructure for water, waste water, and drainage in the Inland Port area including Lancaster.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
192	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-45 to I-20 Segment - Some water line infrastructure improvements will be needed; especially in the area of Hutchins and Wilmer.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
193	County Officials	Dallas County	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	A number of 6 th Call projects, Dallas County recommended the team coordinate with the local cities regarding additional major utilities in the proposed corridor.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
194	County Officials	Dallas County		From US 67 to I-35E Segment - Dallas County is participating with the City of Cedar Hill on the Red Oak Trail project located in the southeast part of Cedar Hill west of Joe Wilson Road and north of the County line. Additionally, a number of proposed projects submitted in the Dallas County MCIP 6 th Call for Projects on Hampton Road and Bear Creek Road pending selection in 2013.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
195	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-35E to I-45 Segment - There are ongoing roadway projects near the Inland Port area and a planned waterline project. Additionally, a number proposed projects submitted in the Dallas County MCIP 6 th Call for Projects pending selection in 2013.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. A meeting with the IIPOD representatives is anticipated within the next couple months.
196	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-45 to I-20 Segment - Malloy Bridge Road from US 175 to Crestview in the City of Seagoville.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
197	County Officials	Dallas County	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	NA	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
198	County Officials	Dallas County	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	NA	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
199	County Officials	Dallas County	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	NA	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
200	County Officials	Dallas County	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Yes, most of the proposed Loop 9 corridor and southeast Dallas in particular.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
201	County Officials	Dallas County		Yes, Southern Dallas County. Loop 9 could help provide a better alternative for current truck traffic through cities.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
202	County Officials	Dallas County	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Trinity, Duke Realty, Hillwood Development, Mr. Slackmon who owns about 800 acres near the airport.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. These major stakeholders will be added to the public meeting invitee list.
203	County Officials	Dallas County		From US 67 to I-35E Segment - The Cities of Cedar Hill, Glenn Heights and Ovilla within or near this segment of Loop 9.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
204	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-35E to I-45 Segment and From I-45 to I-20 Segment - Nearby cities and also landowners, especially those with acreage in the thousands.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
205	County Officials	Dallas County	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	The Landfill. Also these should be verified with individual cities ETJs.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. A meeting with the representatives of Skyline Landfill is anticipated within the next couple months.
206	County Officials	Dallas County		From US 67 to I-35E Segment - Several existing neighborhoods lie in this area.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Every effort will be made to avoid existing neighborhoods/communities.
207	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-35E to I-45 Segment - Bear Creek Subdivision near SH 342. Proposed expansion of the Skyline Landfill in Ferris. Potential future development southeast of the Bear Creek and Houston School intersection that was identified during the previous Loop 9 DEIS.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	The proposed Duncanville Rd to Westmoreland Rd Shift Option eliminates the need to take homes in the Bear Creek subdivision compared to the taking of 4 homes in the Bear Creek subdivision per the DEIS Alternatives. A meeting with the representatives of Skyline Landfill is anticipated within the next couple months.
208	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-45 to I-20 Segment - The Highland Meadows development as well as the future developments of Falcon's Lair, Camaro 375, and Hunter's Ridge.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
209	County Officials	Dallas County	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	Yes, Oncor has a main station along Bear Creek Road near Lancaster. See Response to #4.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
210	County Officials	Dallas County		From US 67 to I-35E Segment - Please inquire with the Cities of Cedar Hill, Glenn Heights and Ovilla.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Local official interviews have been conducted with the cities of Cedar Hill, Glenn Heights and Ovilla. All three cities are on the Task Force meeting invitee list as well.
211	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-35E to I-45 Segment - Oncor transmission lines, and Skyline Landfill north of Ferris.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. A meeting with the representatives of Skyline Landfill is anticipated within the next couple months.
212	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-45 to I-20 Segment - The Trinity River Authority (TRA) of Texas Treatment Plant @ 1430 Malloy Bridge Circle.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. A meeting with the representatives of Trinity River Authority has already been conducted.
213	County Officials	Dallas County	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	This needs to be coordinated with municipalities.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Local official interviews have been conducted. All three cities are on the Task Force meeting invitee list as well.
214	County Officials	Dallas County		From US 67 to I-35E Segment - As mentioned previously there is an ongoing Red Oak Trail project with the City of Cedar Hill.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
215	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-35E to I-45 Segment - Existing Skyline Landfill.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. A meeting with the representatives of Skyline Landfill is anticipated within the next couple months.
216	County Officials	Dallas County		From I-45 to I-20 Segment - The Trinity River Authority (TRA) of Texas Treatment Plant @ 1430 Malloy Bridge Circle. Additionally, the County's 518-acre River Bend open space preserve that is located at Malloy Bridge Road and the Trinity River	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. A meeting with the representatives of Trinity River Authority has already been conducted. Every effort will be taken to avoid the open space preserve located at Malloy Bridge Rd and the Trinity River.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
				need to be avoided.				
217	County Officials	Dallas County	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	No, but the County prefers as much of the alignment to be located in Dallas County as possible.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
218	County Officials	Dallas County		When possible keep alignment in Dallas County.	11/9/2012	Dallas County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
219	County Officials	Dallas County	Additional comments	None.				Comment Acknowledged.
	City of Lancaster							
220	City Officials	City of Lancaster	What is your community's goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	It is an economic development engine as it will provide future connectivity from the Lancaster portion of the Inland port to both I-45 and I-35E with minimal impact for citizens and residents.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
221	City Officials	City of Lancaster	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Once the industrial area to the east develops, it will be for future congestion relief and connection to major interstates.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
222	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	Yes, on the east side of the City to provide potential water and sewer connections to Wilmer and Ferris.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
223	City Officials	City of Lancaster		There are existing water lines along Beltline Road.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
224	City Officials	City of Lancaster	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	Ferris Road is planned to be reconstructed from the current undivided two lanes to a divided	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
225	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	Somewhat, we are in the process of updating Comprehensive Plan to address.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
226				18-24 Month process will start in January 2013.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
227	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	Zoning to the annexed area and the update to the Comprehensive Plan.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
228	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Zoning of the annexed area will show as zone AO (agricultural) until rezoned in the future.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
229	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	South Dallas County Infrastructure Analysis (SDCIA).	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
230	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	No.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
231	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Property owners at the intersection of Bear Creek and I-35E and the Bear Creek Ranch Subdivision in ETJ.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
232	City Officials	City of Lancaster		The property at Bear Creek and I-35E is zoned residential/mixed use.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
233	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Bear Creek Ranch Subdivision at FM 342, the property may develop further south in the future.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
234	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	Bear Creek Ranch Subdivision (Lancaster MUD #1)	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	The Duncanville Rd. to Westmoreland Rd Corridor Shift Option avoids 4 residential relocations in the Bear Creek subdivision compared to the DEIS Alternatives.
235	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Potential development to the south.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
236	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	No, City will provide Utility files in GIS format – Contact Shwetha Pandurangi.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
237	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	No.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
238	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	North of Ellis County line because the City of Lancaster would be better alignment to assist in feeding into Airport and East Industrial area.	11/9/2012	City of Lancaster	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
239	City Officials	City of Lancaster		The North alignment (shown on the exhibit) is the preferred alignment by the City of Lancaster.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
240	City Officials	City of Lancaster	Additional comments	Lancaster supports the Loop 9 Project.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
241	City Officials	City of Lancaster		A number of the City streets are also planned for improvements but none will adversely impact the proposed Loop 9 project.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
242	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Lancaster has completed the airport expansion Master Plan – it was concluded in the master plan study that the air traffic does not support the expansion of the facility to a commercial airport.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
243	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Lancaster Regional Airport runway is currently 5,000 feet, but is planned to be expanded to a 6,500-foot runway and eventually to an 8,000-foot runway. However this expansion would not adversely impact implementation of the proposed Loop 9 project.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
244	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Lancaster would like to see all inputs provided by the City during the DEIS process maintained going forward.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
245	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Lancaster would like to know if both of the alignments presented in Attachment D and Attachment E are still being considered.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	At this time, all DEIS Alternatives are still being considered as well as proposed Corridor Shift Option as presented at the February 2013 Region Task Force Meetings.
246	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Lancaster is not aware of the presence of any historical resources in the proposed study corridor inside Lancaster. However, would like to be notified in advance if such resources are identified inside Lancaster.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
247	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Lancaster would like to be provided with a copy of the Power Point presentation.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
248	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Lancaster will provide with a revised map showing the latest annexations in GIS format.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
249	City Officials	City of Lancaster		Lancaster prefers the north alignment (depicted in blue in Attachment D).	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
250	Managing Director Public Works/ Development Services	City of Lancaster		Rona Stringfellow stated that the current City Master Plan was developed with the Loop 9 alignment factored in.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
251	Managing Director Public Works/ Development Services	City of Lancaster		Rona Stringfellow stated that when constructed, the Loop 9 project will help service truck traffic in the City.	11/9/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
	City of Glenn Heights							
252	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	What is your community's goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	The current Loop 9 alignment will affect 120+ acres of prime real estate along I-35E and south of Bear Creek Road. This site has been identified by staff as a great opportunity for big box retail coupled with multiple co-site stores and our restaurant(s).	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
253	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		Additionally, the current iteration of Loop 9 will affect future residential development to the far west of our city- specifically, near Cockrell Hill Road. As of late there has been several inquiries from developers interested in building. However, they have been hesitant until further notice regarding final plans to Loop 9.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
254	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Construction of S. Hampton Road ingress and egress at Loop 9 will relieve congestion at Bear Creek and DART Park-n-Ride.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
255	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		Currently there is heavy traffic on Bear Creek Road due to the DART Park & Ride Station location on Bear Creek Road.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
256	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	Following City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for roadways and utilities (S. Hampton Road, S. Uhl Road, and Westmoreland Road) there are plans for constructing four-lane divided concrete roadways with utilities along the major arterials that are within the path of Loop 9 alignment.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
257	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	Roadways in CIP include S. Hampton Road from E Bear Creek to Ovilla Road, S. Uhl Road from E Bear Creek to Ovilla Road, and Westmoreland Road from W Bear Creek to the City Limits; subdivisions that will be affected by Loop 9 and they are included in the CIP are Mesa Addition and Morgan Heights.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
258	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	If the alignment for proposed Loop 9 is above grade then the zoning designations of the properties along the corridor will not be affected. City of Glenn Heights Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use maps include the proposed Loop 9 alignment and resulting commercial land use along the corridor.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
259	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	There aren't major changes planned in zoning or land development regulation in near future that would affect the Loop 9 corridor planning. However, once the new alignment and design for Loop 9 corridor is near final stage, the City would like the initiate a zoning/land use update reflecting the changed potential for the vacant land along the freeway.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
260	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Other than your community’s comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	City of Glenn Heights Comprehensive Plan was updated in January 2011 that includes demographic and existing conditions analysis for the City. Plan for proposed Town Center property within the alignment of Loop 9 at the Hampton Road interchange projects future mixed use/commercial development in that area.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
261	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Transportation relief is a factor due to no internal highway access within the community.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
262	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	NA	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
263	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	The City of Glenn Heights would like to recommend avoiding the proposed 70-acre Town Center property along Hampton Road if at all possible. Also the Hillwood property along I-35E frontage next to Gateway Estates subdivision is a critical piece of real estate from planning and economic development standpoint. We would like to recommend that the final alignment try to minimize impact on the Hillwood property along I-35E frontage.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	At the intersection of Loop 9 and Hampton Rd, if the corridor were shifted north, more residential homes would be impacted to the northeast of the intersection. If the corridor were shifted south, more residential homes would be impacted southwest the intersection. There the proposed DEIS Alternative remains the only option to be carried forward in the Corridor Feasibility Study. Other minimization efforts could be analyzed during the Design/NEPA and final design phases of the project. The Hillwood property, northwest of the intersection of proposed Loop 9 and I-35E is within an area that may or may not be considered for direct connectors. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
264	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		Mesa residential development is located north of the proposed Town Center. The Lindale residential area east of the proposed Town Center is an area that could be impacted. There is a commercial project east of Cockrell Hill Road, south of Bear Creek Road that is important.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	At this time, the DEIS Alternative is the only option at Hampton Rd intersection will be moved forward in the Corridor/Feasibility Study. This option may impact residential homes of the Mesa neighborhood depending on necessary ramps, etc. At this time the DEIS Alternative is the only option east of the future Town Center that will be moved forward in the Corridor/Feasibility Study. This option will impact residential homes in the northern section of Lindale; however, if the corridor was shifted south, impacts to the Town Center property would increase and if the corridor were shifted north, this would result in impacts to the Glenn Heights water tower at Uhl Rd. Impacts to the property east of Cockrell Hill Rd. and south of Bear Creek Rd. have been minimized by shifting the corridor south; however, additional impacts may occur to the property depending on access, ramps, etc at the intersection of Loop 9 and Cockrell Hill Rd. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
265	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	The City's 1 million gallon elevated water storage reservoir is located within the proposed Loop 9 alignment on S. Uhl Road. Future large water mains are scheduled along the parkway of S. Uhl Road, S. Hampton Road and Westmoreland Road. These mains must be installed during or prior construction of Loop 9.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
266	TxDOT Project Manager	City of Glenn Heights		Bruce Nolley stated that he has been contacted already by Hillwood Development Company regarding the revised Loop 9 concept.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
267	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	NA	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
268	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	Widening and upgrade of S. Uhl Road and S. Hampton Road through the proposed alignment of Loop 9 should be improved during construction.	11/13/2012	City of Glenn Heights	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads and ramp locations would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
269	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights	Additional comments	The City has expressed concerns about impacts to the City's water tower located at the corner of South Uhl Road and proposed Loop 9. The City wants to ensure that the proposed Loop 9 does not impact the water tower.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	At this time, the DEIS Alternative is the only option at the Uhl Rd. intersection will be moved forward in the Corridor/Feasibility Study. This option with a 350-foot ROW does impact the parcel where the water tower is located; however, does not impact the water tower. However, additional impacts may occur to the property depending on access, ramps, etc at the intersection of Loop 9 and Cockrell Hill Rd. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
270	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		The City indicated a large property near the intersection of Cocker Hill Road and Bear Creek Road within the proposed ROW was future planned commercial property.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Impacts to the property east of Cockrell Hill Rd. and south of Bear Creek Rd. have been minimized by shifting the corridor south; however, additional impacts may occur to the property depending on access, ramps, etc at the intersection of Loop 9 and Cockrell Hill Rd. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
								environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
271	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		The City supports the new design concept at the I-35E interchange. The revised design concept will attract more developments in the area.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
272	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		The City prefers to have full access to and from the proposed Loop 9 at S. Hampton Road. Exit ramp from the proposed westbound Loop 9 to South Hampton Road was not proposed in the DEIS – The city would like to see this access being provided as part of the revised design preferably as a full Diamond interchange.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
273	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		The parcel located at the southeast quadrant of the proposed Loop 9 alignment intersection with S. Hampton Road has been planned to be developed for a Town Center. The City prefers impacts to this parcel be minimized if it could not be avoided completely.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	At this time, the DEIS Alternative is the only option at Hampton Rd intersection will be moved forward in the Corridor/Feasibility Study. If the corridor was shifted south, impacts to the Town Center property would increase and if the corridor were shifted north, this would result in impacts to Mesa residential development and Glenn Heights water tower at Uhl Rd. This option may impact residential homes of the Mesa neighborhood depending on necessary ramps, etc. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
								environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
274	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		The City has completed a modified Master Plan which included widening of South Hampton Road, South Uhl Road and Westmoreland Road. The City would like to see the proposed Loop 9 design finalized before the next City Bond election in about 2 years.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
275	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		The City's CIP includes the proposed Loop 9 corridor and as such the City would like to see the project expedited to the implementation phase.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
276	City Officials	City of Glenn Heights		The City prefers all communications with the City be through the City Manager's office until the January election when the next Mayor will be voted in.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
	Ellis County							
277	County Officials	Ellis County	What is your community's goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Ellis County has no official goal for this project. Unofficially, we strive to be at team player in the region, a good neighbor to Dallas County and to promote the plans of our member cities.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
278	County Officials	Ellis County	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Funding for transportation needs in the county is paramount. Safety throughout the county is as important. Congestion relief, especially along major arterials in our northern sector and additional ramps along I-35E in the southern half of the county is also important.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
279	County Officials	Ellis County	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	None at this time. Note: TxDOT Dallas District has contracted with HDR to conduct a Corridor Study along FM 664. Project limits are from US 287 (Waxahachie) to I-45 (Ferris).	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
280	County Officials	Ellis County	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	See above note. No other projects are planned from a County standpoint. Each city should provide CIP plans and timing directly to you concerning projects within their boundaries.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
281	County Officials	Ellis County	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	The County does not have the authority to zone or prescribe density. The County may allow one d.u./ac. if sewer system available.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
282	County Officials	Ellis County	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	Yes, Ellis County is in the process of revising our existing Subdivision Regulation. Revisions should not impact your study.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
283	County Officials	Ellis County		SE Corridor (Loop9) from US 67 south to US 287- reclassify from Proposal Freeway to Principle Arterial (controlled access) constructed in a 120-130 ft. row.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
284	County Officials	Ellis County		SE Corridor (Loop9) from US 67 north to Ellis/ Dallas County line—revise proposed freeway ROW to 300-350 ft.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
285	County Officials	Ellis County		Remove proposed freeway SH 360 Extension from US 67 south to I-35E near Milford.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
286	County Officials	Ellis County		Other modification will be evaluated based on the My35 Corridor CSC 2 project modifications; Mobility 2035 Regional Outer Loop (ROL); Regional Thoroughfare Plan and various cities Thoroughfare Plan changes.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
287	County Officials	Ellis County	Other than your community’s comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	Not within the County at this time.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
288	County Officials	Ellis County	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Not to our knowledge.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
289	County Officials	Ellis County	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	It is our understanding a location for the US 67 & SE Corridor interchange has not been determined at this time.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Correct. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation projects that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
290	County Officials	Ellis County		Areas within the potential connection are City of Cedar Hill (Lake Ridge Parkway); Holcim Ltd and Ashgrove Texas LP.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
291	County Officials	Ellis County		Need to verify with the EPA with regard to quarry permits.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
292	County Officials	Ellis County		The county does not want to see the Quarry operation being negatively impacted by the Loop 9 project.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
293	County Officials	Ellis County	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	Holcim-permitted to quarry future lands north of existing quarry.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. A meeting with Holcim Quarry is anticipated in the next couple months.
294	County Officials	Ellis County		Ashgrove-uncertain of EPA/TCEQ permits issued.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
295	County Officials	Ellis County		Locating multi-level interchange near the quarries should consider daily blasting schedules and radius vibration(s) which may affect curing of concrete structures.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
296	County Officials	Ellis County	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	None the county is aware of at this time. Gas transmission lines as well as water transmission lines, etc. were identified in the DEIS.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
297	County Officials	Ellis County		Note: the County has not seen the latest plans for the SE Corridor. Our responses are based on the information provided on the project website.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
298	County Officials	Ellis County	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	Not to our knowledge. Refer to the above note.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
299	County Officials	Ellis County	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	Not to our knowledge. Refer to the above note.	11/13/2012	Ellis County	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
300	County Officials	Ellis County	Additional Comments	The County would like to know the locations of planned access to Loop 9 at Westmoreland and S. Hampton.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
301	Commissioner Bill Dodson	Ellis County		Commissioner Bill Dodson wants to know the traffic projection numbers that were used as a basis to justify the Loop 9 project.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Traffic modeling is ongoing. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
								could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps). The program of projects will be provided in the Corridor/Feasibility Study.
302	Commissioner Bill Dodson	Ellis County		Commissioner Bill Dodson stated the Loop 9 project is intended to move traffic around Dallas and not necessary help traffic move to and from Dallas; therefore, it is going to cost the tax payers more than it would benefit us.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
303	Commissioner Bill Dodson	Ellis County		Commissioner Bill Dodson stated that there are other projects that are higher priority than the Loop 9 project. He also stated current traffic congestions are in the north-south direction more so than in the east-west directions.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
304	Commissioner Bill Dodson	Ellis County		Commissioner Bill Dodson Stated the Loop 9 project is politically driven. In his view, there is too much political influence involved with the Loop 9 project; however, the project does not solve the traffic congestion issues of the communities that it is supposed to help.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
305	Commissioner Bill Dodson	Ellis County		Commissioner Bill Dodson commented that the political agendas should be set aside to do what is good for the tax payers and what is good for the country.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
306	Barbara Leftwich, Ellis County Planner	Ellis County		Barbara Leftwich commented that the county is concerned that the location of the Loop 9 and US 67 interchange may impact existing industries located in the US 67 area. Ashgrove and Holcim both have quarry permits to mine future adjacent land. Both firms also blast on a daily basis which could impact construction of an elevated interchange. She recommended the study consider these factors when deciding on the location of the US 67 and Loop 9 interchange.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Meetings with Holcim and Ashgrove quarries are anticipated in the next couple months.
307	Commissioner Bill Dodson	Ellis County		Commissioner Bill Dodson stated if the intent of the proposed Loop 9 is to serve truck traffic, then he suggested the Loop 9 project be pushed further south and connect I-35W, I-35E, and I-45 at a minimum.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
308	Commissioner Bill Dodson and Commissioner Heath Sims	Ellis County		Both Commissioner Bill Dodson and Commissioner Heath Sims agreed that Dallas does need a loop around the city; however, they both agreed there are several other projects that are greater priorities.	11/13/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
	City of Balch Springs							
309	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	The City of Balch Springs envisions connectivity derived from the Loop 9 project to the city’s I-20 highway corridor from Beltline Road to the eastern city limit. The connectivity to the suggested corridor will help to spur economic development	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
				for vacant land along the corridor.				
310	City Officials	City of Balch Springs		Little or no impact to our City given the current alignment location. That said however, connectivity to I-20 would benefit Balch Springs.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
311	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Connection to major interstate access along I-20 and I-635.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
312	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	The need for wastewater infrastructure to extend along the I-20 corridor (city limit to city limit). The city envisions big box commercial development along the I-20 corridor.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
313	City Officials	City of Balch Springs		The City and TxDOT are looking at reversing and adding new ramps on I-20 in Balch Springs. Additionally, improvements to Beltline Road are planned.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
314	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	Water and wastewater infrastructure along the I-20 corridor and the existing trailer park area near Beltline Road and McKenzie.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
315	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	The existing comprehensive plan and zoning regulations are adequate for commercial development along the I-20 corridor.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
316	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	There are preliminary discussion to update the zoning in terms of land use along the southwest and southeast corridors (I-20 to I-635) of the city to accommodate mixed use and commercial development.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
317	City Officials	City of Balch Springs		Haymarket area; however, this is not in the Loop 9 project area. Other than the Haymaket area, there are no planned changes	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
318	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	Not at this time.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
319	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Yes, the need for major interstate highway access along I-20 and I-635 to promote economic development of vacant land along the two main highway corridors.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
320	City Officials	City of Balch Springs		We are addressing connectivity issues at the I-635/I-20 area with the new ramps currently under construction as well as along I-20 for Haymarket Road just south of US 175.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
321	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	The primary land stakeholders along the I-20 corridor including William Hooper, ETC Sales, etc@airmail.net ; Mike Anderson, FC Properties One LTD, mike@bjanderson.net .	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. These major stakeholders will be added to the public meeting invitee list.
322	City Officials	City of Balch Springs		Mr. Hooper. The former Mayor of Mesquite, Mike Anderson is a majority stakeholder along the I-20 corridor.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. These major stakeholders will be added to the public meeting invitee list.
323	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	None.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
324	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	The plan and construction of a 10ft water line stretching 32 miles from Sunnyvale to Grand Prairie.	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
325	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	None within the City of Balch Springs jurisdiction. However there are park restricted land owned by the City of Mesquite near the intersection of Mercury Road and Beltline Road. There is also ball park operated by the City of Mesquite near McKenzie and Mercury Roads	11./20/2012	The City of Balch Springs	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
326	City Officials	City of Balch Springs		A 10-foot waterline is in progress by DWU from Sunnyville to stretch 32 miles long.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
327	City Officials	City of Balch Springs	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	The priority is to spur economic development along the city's I-20 corridor and an alignment near Lassatter Road and Beltline at I-20 would help to achieve this goal.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
328	Mayor Gordon	City of Balch Springs	Additional Comments	Mayor Gordon asked about the time frame for completion of the feasibility studies.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Anticipated to be within six to eight months.
329	Ed Morris, City Manager / Police Chief	City of Balch Springs		Ed Morris asked where the northern end of the current Loop 9 concept terminates.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	During the local official interview, Bruce Nolley responded that it will be at or near the location shown on the exhibit provided in the meeting.
330	Mayor Gordon	City of Balch Springs		Mayor Gordon asked how the highest priority segments of the project would be determined.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	During the local official interview, Brian Clark responded that the results of interviews that are being conducted with each city and county within the corridor/feasibility study area would be among the factors to help determine priorities. In addition, environmental constraints would be a consideration in determining the priorities.
331	Mayor Gordon	City of Balch Springs		Mayor Gordon asked if the feasibility study on the entire corridor would be completed within a two year time frame.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	During the local official interview, Callie Barnes responded that the corridor/feasibility study has an anticipated 6-8 month timeframe and the EA (if the projects are granted EA classification by FHWA) process is anticipated to take approximately 16 to 18 months.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
332	Chris Dyser, City/EDC Planner /Asst to the City Manager	City of Balch Springs		With regard to major utilities, Chris Dyser stated that Dallas Water Utility (DWU) 10-foot water supply line is planned along and south of I-20.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	During the local official interview, Bruce Nolley stated that he would provide the contact name for an employee of DWU regarding the planned 10-foot water supply line
	City of Red Oak							
333	The City of Red Oak	The City of Red Oak	What is your community's goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Economic development and better regional transportation grid.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
334	The City of Red Oak	The City of Red Oak	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Loop 9 development will provide better east-west connectivity for truck traffic. FM 664 project, planned from two lanes to six-lane, curb and gutter from US 287 to I-45, will allow for the development (commercial, residential, etc.) along FM 664. Loop 9 would greatly benefit the areas where FM 664 widening would occur by keeping the truck traffic off of FM 664 where the development would occur.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
335	The City of Red Oak	The City of Red Oak	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	Commercial development proposed on the northwest corner of the I-35E and Loop 9 intersection.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
336	The City of Red Oak	The City of Red Oak	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	FM 342 proposed improvements are very important to the surrounding area for better north/south connectivity. Improvements to Houston School Road are also important.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
337	The City of Red Oak	The City of Red Oak	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	Yes, the local comprehensive plan and land use controls are currently adequate.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
338	The City of Red Oak	The City of Red Oak	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	The area near the intersection of Bear Creek Road and FM 342 is planned to be re-zoned from Agricultural to Commercial; however, the regulations will not change.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
339	City Officials	The City of Red Oak	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	The I-35E Plan and the City of Red Oak Comprehensive Plan.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
340	City Officials	The City of Red Oak	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Yes, most of Red Oak. There is a lack of regional connectivity. The city population had doubled in the last ten years. Most of the people from Red Oak commute to Dallas for work and the connectivity for those commuters is a major problem.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
341	City Officials	The City of Red Oak	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Various developers have inquired with the City regarding future available land for development taking into consideration the Loop 9 alignment and ROW. However, since the City collaborates directly with the interested developers, there is no one the project team should contact.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
342	City Officials	The City of Red Oak	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	An industrial development is proposed on the SW corner of FM 342 and Loop 9 (South alignment) intersection. Retail/commercial development is proposed on the NW corner of the I-35E and proposed Loop 9 intersection. Harmony Estates is a growing residential development located just SW of the intersection of Loop 9 and I-35E. There is also potential future development on the NW corner of the FM 342 and Reindeer Road intersection.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Currently the suggested corridor does not result in the taking of homes in Harmony Lakes. Two corridor shift options have been developed which veer north, west of FM 342 to accommodate the city's request for Loop 9 to follow the path of Reindeer Road to be adjacent and north of the future commercial property.
343	City Officials	The City of Red Oak	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	Power station near Houston School Road.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	The current proposed corridor options do not impact the power station.
344	City Officials	The City of Red Oak	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	No, there are not any points of interest or areas of environmental concern that are important to avoid and/or maintain access.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
345	City Officials	The City of Red Oak	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	The Loop 9 project should follow the county line from I-35E until the point which Loop 9 crosses Houston School Road to provide the best connectivity and protection of developable land.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	There are two corridor shift options just east of I-35E, one follows the county line from I-35E to just west of Houston School Rd. This option could be modified to completely avoid a potential (however unlikely 4(f) farm). This option results in 3 stream crossings between I-35E and FM 342. The 2nd shift option is located in the center of the potential (however unlikely 4(f) farm) and results in 1 less stream crossing than the 1st option described above. The 2nd option does not follow the county line to Houston School Rd.
346	City Officials	The City of Red Oak	Additional Comments	The City expressed support for the revised I-35E and Loop 9 interchange concept.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
347	City Officials	The City of Red Oak		The City prefers Loop 9 cross I-35E at the County Line (consistent with the current alignment).	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The two corridor shift options and the DEIS Alternatives cross I-35E at the county line.
348	City Officials	The City of Red Oak		The City prefers minimal impacts along I-35E in order to attract more development.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The two corridor shift options and the DEIS Alternatives cross I-35E at the county line.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
349	City Officials	The City of Red Oak		East of I-35E, the City prefers the northern alignment (as shown in blue in Attachment C) since there is not much for the City of Red Oak to gain from the southern alignment (as shown in red in Attachment C) east of I-35E. However, just east of I-35E (from I-35E east to Houston School Road, see Attachment C), the City or Red Oak prefers the northern alignment shift further south to follow the county line.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	There are two corridor shift options just east of I-35E that shift north east of I-35E similar to the DEIS Alternatives, but also take into consideration the City of Red Oaks request to follow the county line until Houston School Rd. and follow Reindeer Rd. west of FM 342 to be adjacent to the future commercial property. The 1st shift option follows the county line from I-35E to just west of Houston School Rd. This option could be modified to completely avoid a potential (however unlikely 4(f) farm). This option results in 3 stream crossings between I-35E and FM 342. The 2nd shift option is located in the center of the potential (however unlikely 4(f) farm) and results in 1 less stream crossing than the 1st option described above. The 2nd option does not follow the county line to Houston School Rd.
350	City Officials	The City of Red Oak		The City prefers a four-way frontage road box at the proposed I-35E interchange.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
351	City Officials	The City of Red Oak		The City does not want tolled Loop 9 frontage roads.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
352	City Officials	The City of Red Oak		The City prefers the revised concept as it will have less ROW impacts at the proposed interchange with I-35E. This will allow development at the I-35E interchange, particularly at the southwest corner where a major retail center is planned.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
353	Mayor Hugley	The City of Red Oak		Mayor Hugley stated that the north/south arterials need improvement.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
354	Mayor Hugley	The City of Red Oak		Mayor Hugley suggested the Loop 9 project team coordinate with the ongoing FM 664 project consultant team to ensure that the Loop 9 project works collaboratively with the proposed FM 664 project.	11./20/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
	City of Midlothian							
355	City Officials	City of Midlothian	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Economic development, serving the existing community, and connectivity.	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
356	City Officials	City of Midlothian	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	In general, capacity improvements and safety. Specifically, grade separation at Walnut Grove/287.	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
357	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	Loop 9 stopping at 67 – none. Loop 9 going west 67 – Windsor Hills.	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
358	City Officials	City of Midlothian	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	In relation to Loop 9 – Railport parkway grade separation and access roads on 67. Access improvement. Industrial Park near US 67.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
359	City Officials	City of Midlothian		Access improvement.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
360	City Officials	City of Midlothian		Industrial Park near US 67.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
361	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	Yes, City will provide electronic copy of the City map.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
362	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	No.	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
363	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	No.	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
364	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Yes. US 67 need improvements.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
365	City Officials	City of Midlothian		US 287 need to be converted to a controlled access facility due to safety concerns.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
366	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	Holcim Industrial development.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Meetings with Holcim and Ashgrove quarries are anticipated in the next couple months.
367	City Officials	City of Midlothian		If loop 9 goes west of 67 – Ashgrove. Ashgrove is a quarry. Limestone reserve northeast of active quarry.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Meetings with Holcim and Ashgrove quarries are anticipated in the next couple months.
368	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	US 67 and Shiloh Rd intersection, northeast corner – Potential development. Shiloh Road – Bill Monte	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
369	City Officials	City of Midlothian		There are 12,000 homes in the area planned. Neighborhoods include Windsor Manor, Prairie	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
				Ridge and Grand Prairie.				
370	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	No.	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
371	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	No.	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
372	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	Interchange improvements 67/287.	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
373	City Officials	City of Midlothian	General questions or concerns: The section of Loop 9 between 287 and 67 - why was it cancelled when originally it was of the highest priority?	The section of Loop 9 between 287 and 67 why was it cancelled when originally it was of the highest priority?	11/26/2012	City of Midlothian	Environmental	The updated traffic numbers provided by NCTCOG indicated that this section is no longer the highest priority.
374	City Officials	City of Midlothian	Additional Comments	The City expressed support for the Loop 9 project.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
375	City Manager	City of Midlothian		Don Hasting stated the City does not agree with eliminating the Loop 9 segment between US 67 and US 287 especially considering the residential growth occurring in the area (refer to response to #10 of Attachment B).	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
376	City Manager	City of Midlothian		Don Hasting stated his understanding was that the US 67 to US 287 segment was previously a priority during the DEIS study and he does not understand why this segment is no longer part of the proposed Loop 9 project.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Concerns expressed to TxDOT and NCTCOG.
377	Executive Director of Engineering & Utilities	City of Midlothian		Mike Adams suggested using existing Malloy Bridge Road as part of the Loop 9 alignment.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
								environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
378	City Manager	City of Midlothian		Don Hasting stated he will meet with NCTCOG in order to find out why the US 67 to US 287 segment was eliminated from the Loop 9 proposed project.	11/26/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
	City of Mesquite							
379	City Officials	City of Mesquite	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	The Loop 9 project could potentially serve multiple City goals. First and foremost, it would provide connectivity to Southeast Mesquite, which is largely isolated by the lack of direct, convenient access from the north and south. This would spawn opportunities for industrial development in the direct path of Loop 9 and residential development supporting employment centers within easy commute distance. With improved access the region, the project could possibly induce growth further east along I-20. The city of Mesquite has four square miles of territory just east of the East Fork of the Trinity River and an exterritorial jurisdiction of approximately twenty square miles that is unreachable except via I-20. These areas would be more attractive to development with improved access.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
380	City Officials	City of Mesquite	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Our most immediate transportation need is the reconstruction of our existing roadway infrastructure that has far exceeded its life expectancy, followed by a north-south connection along our eastern corporate limit.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
381	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	The major project is the extension of the SH 190/PBGT south from I-30 to I-20, connecting hopefully to Loop 9.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
382	City Officials	City of Mesquite	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	There is a planned water main and sanitary sewer main line extensions to serve our annexed area east of the East Fork of the Trinity River along I-20 and possible future annexations in our ETJ in Kaufman County.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
383	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	No. The Comprehensive Plan designates the entire area impacted by Loop 9 as appropriate for a special industrial park district. This is not market realistic, even assuming that Loop 9 materializes. Loop 9 would impact the surrounding area positively by opening up more diverse development opportunities, and the	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
				Comprehensive Plan and implementing land use controls would require amendment at that time.				
384	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	Yes. The current land use regulations on properties affected by the proposed path of Loop 9 are antiquated. The regulations are over ten years old and no longer reflect the substance or preferred design of development taking place elsewhere in the City of Mesquite. The City is currently working on a Unified Development Ordinance that will update the Zoning Ordinance and amend standards for the uses proposed in the Loop 9 corridor.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
385	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	Except for the special industrial park district noted in Question 5, there are no special plans relevant projections or land use studies for the area immediately impacted by the Loop 9 project. There are plans for key residential development further north of I-20. Further east, the City has adopted a special zoning district to promote the development of largely sustainable mixed use communities. The Mesquite Independent School District has developed a detailed demographic report that may be of some use to the Loop 9 project.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
386	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	Yes. The portion of Southeast Mesquite centered on the I-20 corridor has no convenient access from north or south. This gap in the local transportation network has impeded development of Southeast Mesquite where the vast majority of available land still exists in the community. Now that the SH 190 extension between Interstate Highways 30 and 20 has been indefinitely delayed, there are no improvements to the network on the horizon that would end the relative isolation of the area. In addition, Mesquite Metro Airport has poor access to the freeway system even though it is the second busiest General Aviation Airport in the region.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
387	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	No. Mesquite lies at the far eastern terminus of Loop 9 where the bulk of the land is undeveloped lowlands and river bottom.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
388	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	There is no existing development within the proposed pathway of the Loop 9 project. However, the projected path takes Loop 9 through a zoned but underdeveloped industrial park district adjacent to I-20. The Loop 9 project would potentially benefit the special district or other development envisioned for the area. Therefore, the project should NOT avoid the proposed pathway.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
389	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	There are three heavy utilities owned or controlled by the North Texas Municipal Water District running east of the East Fork of the Trinity River: 1) the District Reuse Water Line; 2) the Lower East Fork Wastewater Interceptor System; 3) a 24-in diameter water line running along the north side of I-20 to the Heartland Development.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
390	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	No, there are not any points of interest or areas of environmental concern that are important to avoid and/or maintain access.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
391	City Officials	City of Mesquite	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	Loop 9 should connect to SH 190 along I-20 for regional connectivity.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The project team is closely working with the SH 190 project team. Both DEIS Alternative will be moved forward in the Corridor/Feasibility Study until it is decided where SH 190 will connect to I-20.
392	City of Mesquite	City of Mesquite	Additional Comments	The City expressed support for the new Loop 9 concept with reduced ROW.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
393	Jerry Dittman, Assistant City Manager	City of Mesquite		Jerry Dittman stated that the City wants SH 190 and Loop 9 be connected to I-20 at the same location with a grade separated interchange.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The project team is closely working with the SH 190 project team. Both DEIS Alternatives will be moved forward in the Corridor/Feasibility Study until it is decided where SH 190 will connect to I-20. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
394	Jerry Dittman, Assistant City Manager	City of Mesquite		Jerry Dittman stated that he recalls that previously there was an idea to connect Loop 9 and SH 190 to I-20 at two different locations on I-20. He stated that the City would not support this concept.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The project team is closely working with the SH 190 project team. Both DEIS Alternatives will be moved forward in the Corridor/Feasibility Study until it is decided where SH 190 will connect to I-20. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
395	Mayor Monaco	City of Mesquite		Mayor Monaco asked what is the status of SH 190?	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	During the local official interview Bruce Nolley explained that SH 190 is still being developed and TxDOT is working to resolve outstanding decisions regarding the alignment location.
396	Richard Gertson, Director of Community Development	City of Mesquite		Richard Gertson stated that data such as the City's CIP could be downloaded from the City of Mesquite website.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
397	Mayor Monaco	City of Mesquite		Mayor Monaco stated that he would like to see both SH 190 and Loop 9 projects be expedited.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
398	Mayor Monaco	City of Mesquite		Mayor Monaco and Jerry Dittman stated that the City would like to know as soon as the final alignment location is established. The City is flexible with the alignment locations so long as SH 190 and Loop 9 connect to I-20 at a same location.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The project team is closely working with the SH 190 project team. Both DEIS Alternatives will be moved forward in the Corridor/Feasibility Study until it is decided where SH 190 will connect to I-20. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
399	Jerry Dittman, Assistant City Manager	City of Mesquite		Jerry Dittman indicated that a 404 permit application (permit application # 198600927) for a previously planned development called Falcon’s Lair (in the corridor study area) which is no longer being considered was submitted in 2010. Dave Madden was the USACE representative that dealt with the permit. There was a Categorical Exclusion (CSJ: 0095-13024) prepared for the site as well. The information gathered as part of the Categorical Exclusion and the USACE permit application may be useful for the Loop 9 project.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
	City of DeSoto							
400	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	Connectivity. We believe peak traffic generated from south of the City and wanting to access US 67 or I-35E will not have to use DeSoto’s arterials when LP 9 is completed. There is growth potential in the south of the City.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
401	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Congestion relief on the City’s arterials. Allow commuters to by-pass City’s signalized intersections which improves travel time for commuters.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
402	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements for that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	The projects are unfunded; however, the City is in support of the Hampton Road widened project (from Parkerville Road to Glen Creek Road) from 2 lanes to a 4-lane divided. The City hopes this improvement of Hampton Road will be included in the Dallas County MCIP funding.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
403	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	Cockrell Hill Road is under construction – widening from two lane to four lane divided from Beltline Road to Parkerville Road.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
404	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	We are updating the Comprehensive Plan.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
405	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Are they any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	No.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
406	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Other than your community’s comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	The Hampton redevelopment between Pleasant Run and Beltline.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
407	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	No.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
408	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	No.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
409	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these developments be avoided?	No. However there is a school proposed on the corner of Cockrell Road and West Parkerville Road.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged. The current proposed corridor options and DEIS Alternatives (still under consideration at Cockrell Hill Rd.) do not impact the future school location.
410	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	No.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
411	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	No.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
412	The City of DeSoto	City of DeSoto	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	No.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
413	Tom Johnson, Managing Director Development Services	City of DeSoto	Additional Comments	Tom Johnson asked if the crossing of the proposed Loop 9 at the major arterials, specifically Hampton Road and Cockrell Hill Road, would remain the same as what was in the DEIS study. Tom Johnson stated that he would like to know, once determined, the proposed design for Hampton Road and Cockrell Hill.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Brian Clark explained that the proposed Loop 9 project is not final and that the previously proposed major arterials crossing designs would be analyzed as part of the ongoing Corridor/Feasibility Study.
414	Tom Johnson, Managing Director Development Services			Tom Johnson stated that the City prefers the DEIS interchange configuration at I-35E with direct connectors at I-35E. He also stated that he understands that the Loop 9 alignment location would have to be at about where it is shown in the exhibit.	12/10/2012			Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
415	City Officials	City of DeSoto		The City expressed support for the new Loop 9 concept with reduced ROW.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
416	City Officials	City of DeSoto		The City believes that Loop 9 will help to reduce traffic traveling through the town.	12/10/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
	City of Oak Leaf							
417	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	What is your community’s goal for the Loop 9 project (economic development, serving the	Connectivity to US 67; FM 664 does not provide good east-west connectivity because of school	12/12/2012	Interview	Development	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Local Government Interviews

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
			existing community, connectivity, etc.)?	zones and stop lights.				
418	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	In your opinion, what is the immediate transportation need for your community (congestion relief, connection to major interstate, safety in one or multiple areas)?	Connection to Loop 9.	12/12/2012	Interview	Transportation	Comment Acknowledged. Once the traffic modeling has been completed and access needs identified, preliminary frontage roads, ramp locations and possible direct connectors would be identified. A program of prioritized projects will then be recommended which identifies individual transportation project that may include frontage roads and ramps at select locations. These individual transportation projects would then be advanced for more detailed engineering and environmental clearance. Additional refinements could be made to the proposed alignment and ancillary facilities (e.g. frontage roads, bridge locations, access ramps).
419	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Are there any areas within your community that you are planning long-term infrastructure improvements that the proposed project should consider providing access to as part of this Loop 9 Feasibility Study? If so, can you please explain the concept of development, plan or phasing of the development?	No.	12/12/2012	Interview	Planning	Comment Acknowledged.
420	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	What projects are included in your Capital Improvement Plan relative to local roadways and utilities?	None. Hampton Road would be a priority but it is controlled by Glenn Heights. Areas in southern Oak Leaf are available for development, but no plans exist currently.	12/12/2012	Interview	Development	Comment Acknowledged.
421	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Do you think the local comprehensive plan and land use controls (zoning, subdivision regulations, etc.) are currently adequate?	NA	12/12/2012	Interview	Planning	Comment Acknowledged.
422	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Are there any major changes in zoning or land development regulations likely to occur in the near or distant future? If so, can you please elaborate?	NA	12/12/2012	Interview	Development	Comment Acknowledged.
423	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Other than your community's comprehensive plan, are there existing special area redevelopment plans, build out analysis, demographic projections, or any other studies of future land use/development patterns?	NA	12/12/2012	Interview	Development	Comment Acknowledged.
424	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Has any part of your community been poorly served by or isolated from the transportation network? How do you expect that to change in the future?	We need an east to west corridor and Loop 9 will serve that need.	12/12/2012	Interview	Transportation	Comment Acknowledged.
425	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Are there any other major stakeholders within your community that could provide specific information pertinent to the development of the alignment location for the proposed Loop 9 project?	NA	12/12/2012	Interview	Development	Comment Acknowledged.
426	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Are there any residential, commercial or industrial developments near or within the proposed ROW that are planned or proposed that should be avoided? If so, why should these	NA	12/12/2012	Interview	Planning	Comment Acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Local Government Interviews**

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Question	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
			developments be avoided?					
427	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Are there any areas with heavy utilities that you know of within or near the proposed ROW?	The City’s water supply comes from the City of Glenn Heights so there are waterlines from Glenn Heights to Oak Leaf along Hampton Road and Uhl Road. There are electrical lines along FM 664.	12/12/2012	Interview	Development	Comment Acknowledged.
428	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Are there any points of interest or areas of environmental concern (recreation areas, parks, historic structures, lakes, etc.) that are important to avoid and/or maintain access? If so, can you explain the importance of these areas?	NA	12/12/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
429	City Officials	City of Oak Leaf	Are there specific alignment locations that need to be considered or reconsidered in your area? What are the reasons?	NA	12/12/2012	Interview	Planning	Comment Acknowledged.
430	City Officials	Mayor Craig Wilson	Additional Comments	The City expressed support of the new Loop 9 concept with reduced ROW.	12/12/2012	Interview	Environmental	During the local official interview Brian Clark stated the possibility that tolled bridges at major grade separations could be constructed together with the frontage roads.
431	City Officials	Mayor Craig Wilson		Mayor Craig Wilson mentioned the ongoing FM 664 design process and reminded the Loop 9 team to coordinate with the FM 664 team	12/12/2012	Interview	Environmental	During the local official interview Brian Clark explained the revised concept at the interchange with I-35E. He explained the reduction of the proposed ROW width with the current design concept in comparison to the DEIS design concept.
432	City Officials	Mayor Craig Wilson		Mayor Craig Wilson stated that Loop 9is a great project and that Oak Leaf is on the fringe of the study area which would reduce impacts to the city. The FM 664 widening would act as a buffer between Loop 9 and the city.	12/12/2012	Interview	Environmental	During the local official interview Bruce Nolley stated that his office is managing both projects and coordination is occurring.
433	City Officials	Mayor Pro-Tem, James Pierce		Mayor Pro-Tem, James Pierce stated concern regarding the timing of when the Loop 9 project will be constructed.	12/12/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.
434	City Officials	Mayor Craig Wilson		The Mayor suggested the study team could meet with the North Ellis County Coalition of Cities (NECCC) in January to provide an update and gather information from numerous cities in the study area at one time.	12/12/2012	Interview	Environmental	Comment Acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study

Comments – Task Force Meetings

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
	Dallas County						
1	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	Need to address concerns of Cedar Hill Council Member and residents regarding potential impacts to neighborhoods that would receive additional traffic if Loop 9 were connected to Lake Ridge Parkway as shown in one of the schematics presented at February stakeholder meeting. Nearby residents in Grand Prairie along the Lake Ridge Parkway corridor may have similar concerns.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Planning	The Loop 9 team evaluated the potential impact of the proposed corridor terminating at Lake Ridge Parkway. Lake Ridge Parkway is an existing 4-lane divided urban arterial. Six different tie-in alternatives traffic model scenarios were analyzed to investigate various facility types and terminus option for Loop 9. The results of this analysis showed that the six proposed options increased traffic on Lake Ridge Parkway, however, the increase volumes were less than the amount that a 4-lane divided arterial could accommodate.
2	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	The proposed solution of a Loop 9 “business route” through Cedar Hill and Grand Prairie could also be a problem for residential neighborhoods especially if Lake Ridge Parkway is the route. For this concept, alternative alignments should be reviewed that would pass through existing business and industrial areas rather than residential areas.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Planning	The alternative alignments have been developed to avoid and minimize impacts to both residential and commercial structures throughout the corridor.
3	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	To the extent possible preference is to have Loop 9 alignment within Dallas County. Favor developable interchanges in instances where alignment may pass into Ellis County such as IH 35E interchange near City of Red Oak.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Planning	Comment acknowledged.
4	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	In agreement with NCTCOG origin-destination studies that show IH 20 will remain the primary east-west facility for Southern Dallas County to access the greater DFW region, while Loop 9 would serve as more of a local facility within southern Dallas County.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Development	Comment acknowledged.
5	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	Very important to keep Loop 9 implementation on schedule to not miss funding opportunities. It is encouraging to hear that no significant delays to schedule are anticipated for studying and resolving Cedar Hill situation.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Development	Comment acknowledged.
6	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	First priority is the IH 35E to IH 45 segment, then US 67 to IH 35E. It is reassuring to know that these priorities match with projected traffic volumes from NCTCOG studies.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Planning	Comment acknowledged.
7	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	Near IH 45 Loop 9 should accommodate planned roadway improvements serving Inland Port detailed in the Southern Dallas County Infrastructure Analysis completed in 2012.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Development	Comment acknowledged.
8	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	Also near IH 45 careful coordination needed by landfill and Oncor transmission towers.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Planning	Comment acknowledged. The project team will continue coordination with Waste Management and Oncor.
9	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	Willing to follow-up with FHWA officials if any barriers causing delays in process are encountered, until then will continue to let process move forward.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Development	Comment acknowledged.
10	Commissioner Price, Judge Jenkins, Lauren Mish Alberta Blair, Antoinette Bacchus, Jonathan Toffer	Dallas County	Agree with recommendation to keep existing Loop 9 since so many in this area are familiar with the name.	3/19/2013	Email response to Atkins - Brian Clark and Callie Barnes	Planning	Comment acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study Comments – Task Force Meetings

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
City of Cedar Hill							
11	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Nothing herein should be construed as Cedar Hill’s endorsement or approval of the concepts describe below.	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	Comment acknowledged.
12	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Preferred Alignment Option: The alignment shown at the February 28, 2013 public meeting showed modifications to Alt. 2. Cedar Hill has publicly supported the Alt. 1 alignment (see: Cedar Hill Comprehensive Plan). Why was Alternative 2 selected? To be consistent with Cedar Hill’s Comprehensive Plan and previous directions the proposed alignment should extend to Alt 1.	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	Loop 9 tie-in options at Lake Ridge Parkway have been adjusted to allow options from both DEIS Alternatives.
13	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Future Arterial Street Intersections: Full interchanges should be provided for arterial street extensions as shown on the Cedar Hill Comprehensive Plan. These include Tar/South Cedar Hill Road, South Clark Road, Joe Wilson Road, Duncanville Road and South Cockrell Hill Road (see: Cedar Hill Comprehensive Plan).	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	Specific details regarding locations of interchanges will be determined as each individual project progresses.
14	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Cedar Hill’s Adopted Parks and Trail Master Plan: Details should be provided that shows how the Hike and Bike paths connections as per the Cedar Hill Parks and Trails Master Plan (see: Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan). The current plan shows a hike and bike trail crossing US 67 and continuing easterly along the extension of Lake Ridge Parkway. How with the hike and bike trail be accommodated with the newly proposed alignment of Loop-9?	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	Hike and bike trails will be evaluated during the development phase of each individual project.
15	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Lake Ridge Parkway Endpoint: The potential connection of Loop-9 into Lake Ridge Parkway is worthy of study, however, before Cedar Hill can provide meaningful comment, traffic forecasts for Lake Ridge Parkway are needed to be compared between the various options. (SEE NEXT)	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	The Loop 9 team evaluated the potential impact of the proposed corridor terminating at Lake Ridge Parkway. Lake Ridge Parkway is an existing 4-lane divided urban arterial. Six different tie-in alternatives traffic model scenarios were analyzed to investigate various facility types and terminus option for Loop 9. The results of this analysis showed that the six proposed options increased traffic on Lake Ridge Parkway, however, the increase volumes were less than the amount that a 4-lane divided arterial could accommodate.
16	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Option 1 – (currently planned option) - Loop-9 tying into US 67 south of Lake Ridge Parkway. This option would provide for: 1. Lake Ridge Parkway to continue easterly over US 67 as an Arterial Street; 2. Provide Lake Ridge Parkway full on/off interchange access to US 67, and 3. Provide Lake Ridge Parkway full on/off interchange access to Loop-9.	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	Comment acknowledged.
17	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Option 2 - Loop-9 terminating into Lake Ridge Parkway. This option should provide for: 1. Interchange design similar to SH 161 at I-20 & Lake Ridge Parkway; 2. Show how hike and bike paths, per the Cedar Hill Parks and Trails Master Plan, could be accommodated; 3. Show how access to the Loop-9 Commuter Rail Station/TOD (see: Cedar Hill Comprehensive Plan) could be accessed.	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	Comment acknowledged.
18	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Major areas of concern are: 1. The LOS on Lake Ridge Parkway; 2. The number of trucks opting to take Lake Ridge Parkway; 3. Local accessibility to US 67 / Loop-9; 4. Accommodation of hike & bike trail.	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	Comment acknowledged.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – Task Force Meetings

#	Commenter Name & Title	Affiliation	Comment	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Category	Response
19	City Officials	City of Cedar Hill	Potential Alignment Adjustments: 1. The alignment of Loop-9 along Bear Creek Parkway is a throwback to when the 1990’s objective of keeping Loop-9 in Dallas County (Dallas County was funding the study). Since this is no longer a paramount consideration and since much of the alignment has shifted to the south, it may be cost beneficial to consider eliminating the Bear Creek Road alignment in favor of an alignment that more closely follows the County line.2. If the alignment is to remain along Bear Creek Road, it should be rechecked to insure that adequate commercial development opportunities remain for all four corners. 3. ROW vacant land for Loop-9 has been provided with the development of the Bear Creek Ranch Addition. What would be the impact if the alignment were to be adjusted to minimize property take within this subdivision?	4/3/2013	Mail	Planning	Comment acknowledged.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
1				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Groppe states that it is difficult to support a project that does not try to preserve the natural resources of the area. The area residents live in south Dallas County/north Ellis County because of the availability of open space so close to the city which cannot be found north of Dallas. He believes politicians use “mostly open land” or “mostly undeveloped land” to describe the resources in the pathway of the proposed highway but much of it has been in production since around 1850. He states that it isn’t a barren landscape waiting for urban sprawl but an area rich in history and worth preserving.	No	<p>The need for the proposed Loop 9 project is to provide important east-west connectivity, reduce travel times, and support economic development opportunities in the study area. The existing east-west arterial roadways do not provide adequate carrying capacity and there are no highways in the immediate vicinity. It is anticipated that traffic conditions will worsen as the area continues to grow in population and commercial/industrial development. TxDOT is using public involvement activities like these public meetings to identify important resources in the study area so that these areas can be protected from the proposed roadway.</p> <p>TxDOT and project consultants met with the Groppes in 2013, on their property to discuss the potential impacts to Heath Lake and the Royce Hartis land.</p> <p>Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.</p>
2				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Groppe identified two specific areas to be avoided and drew a shift in the alignment between D3 and D4. The first area identified was Heath Lake. Mr. Groppe indicates that this area is a deep bowl-shaped drainage that supports migratory waterfowl and is surrounded by woody habitat. The second area identified is the Royce Hartis place with leased land. Mr. Groppe states this is a 300-acre longhorn and angus cattle ranch run by the 4th generation of the Hartis family. Loop 9 would bisect this property and separate the barn from the grazing land, possibly ending the operation of their ranch.	Yes	Thank you for your input.
3				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Groppe provided a sketch of an alternate alignment of the D3/D4 section as it passes over Nokomis Rd. The alternate alignment would extend further south than currently shown and cross Nokomis Road and the intersection of Stainback Rd. This would keep the alignment south of Stainback Rd until joining back with the existing current alignment at the corner of the Hartis property. The purpose of this alternate alignment would be to bypass Heath Lake, the Hartis homestead and residences on Raintree Rd while allowing continued development on Raintree Rd.	Yes	Thank you for your input.
4				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Groppe states that the proposed roadway would skirt their land and cut across Heath Lake. This lake is surrounded by woods which support a variety of wildlife and they have invested a lot of time and money into cleaning up the area and putting in walking/riding trails. The roadway as currently proposed would disturb humans and animals.	No	<p>TxDOT and project consultants met with the Groppes in 2013, on their property to discuss the potential impacts to Heath Lake and the Royce Hartis land.</p> <p>Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.</p>

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
5				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Groppe requests that the alignment extend south to avoid Heath Lake. The lake provides habitat for migratory species; a bird census for this area was conducted in 2011. Since that time, they have made improvements to the lake to increase its size.	Yes	Thank you for your input.
6				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Bowsher states that his land has been impacted by this project for at least five years because no decision has been made on when/where the road will be built. He has been unable to make improvements to his land since there is the possibility it will be purchased by the state in the future. He believes the majority of his land will be landlocked with the new road and the presence of Ten Mile Creek and will be unusable. He asks TxDOT to make a decision to either move forward with this project or shelve it because keeping people in limbo is unconscionable.	No	The outcome of the Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study will be a Program of Projects that identifies specific sections of Loop 9 that can move forward into the preliminary design and environmental analysis phase of the project. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies. Once specific sections are established, a preliminary schedule for environmental clearance, right-of-way acquisition and beginning construction will be established.
7				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Johnson is worried about the commercial area and how it will affect her land. She requests a tree line and barriers to protect against noise impacts.	No	Commercial developments are not proposed as part of the Loop 9 project. Development along the Loop 9 corridor will be guided by the local municipalities and they are able to provide information on how zoning ordinances and land use guidelines may affect adjacent lands. A noise analysis will be conducted as part of the environmental analysis phase. If a noise barrier is determined to be reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers. Landscaping is not a sufficient abatement measure for noise impacts along a highway and trees are considered a safety hazard within TxDOT right-of-way.
8				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Roos asks to be added to the mailing list and states his support for the project. He asks whether it will be possible to develop trails or equestrian facilities within the right-of-way. Also, he requests that a vegetated buffer be planted on both sides of the right-of-way as soon as possible to minimize the visual impact of the project.	No	Mr. Roos has been added to the mailing list. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be included as part of the ultimate Loop 9 design along frontage roads and cross streets. TxDOT is unable to provide equestrian trails within the Loop 9 corridor because it would be an unsafe condition for motorists traveling at 70mph. Local municipalities would be responsible for providing this type of facility in the area.
9				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Perez requests that D3 be left as is.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
10				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Ballew questions why the project is proposed because the population growth south of I-20 does not match that in the northern parts of the DFW area.	No	Central and northern Dallas County as well as Collin County contain a network of high-speed facilities and high-capacity arterial roadways which support the population growth in the area. Although the cities in southern Dallas County and northern Ellis County are not increasing at the same rate as northern cities, the roadway network is not sufficient for the existing populations.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
11				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Rabe owns 90 acres of land in Mesquite at the intersection of I-20 and Shannon Rd. He supports the project but believes it is 5 years too late. He is disheartened that the project may not be constructed for another five to 10 years.	No	Thank you for your comment.
12				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	Yes	No	Ms. Miranda requests that Loop 9 follow the D3 option. Her family built their dream home in 2005 and would be devastated to lose it. She states that she would prefer a toll road not ever be built in the area.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
13				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Miranda repeated her preference for the D3 alignment on the study area map provided at the meeting.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
14				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Ratcliff states that the city limits shown on the exhibits at the meeting are incorrect. She states that she can provide the current city limits.	No	Thank you. The project team will contact the city for updated information.
15				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Perez requests that D3 is left as is.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
16				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	The commenter believes the expansion of Ovilla Road would satisfy the traffic needs between I-35E and I-45.	No	The proposed Loop 9 corridor and expanded Ovilla Road facility serve different purposes and needs. The need for the proposed Loop 9 project is to provide important east-west connectivity, reduce travel times, and support economic development opportunities in the study area. The expansion of Ovilla Road is needed to address congestion, growing traffic volumes, and safety concerns.
17				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	Yes	Mr. Harkrider states that in the Seagoville area there the “Brookfield” Army Air Field which contains WWI parts and pieces buried everywhere. This area is owned by Admiral Richard Byrd’s family east of the Trinity and William Hal Harkrider west of the Trinity.	No	During the environmental analysis phase of the Loop 9 project, archeologists will conduct a survey of the proposed right-of-way that includes shovel testing to determine if any artifacts are present.
18				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. DeVall is against the Loop 9 project. He believes that traffic is heading north/south and not east/west. He states that if TxDOT would like to provide traffic relief, they should visit US 67 and I-20 at 6:30 in the morning or evening and see that the movements are north/south. Loop 9 will not benefit the area.	No	Thank you for your input.
19				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Adams believes the road is necessary but no part of it should be tolled or considered for tolling. He suggests that existing east/west roadways should be used in order to reduce impacts to subdivisions and communities.	No	Tolling is under consideration as a funding mechanism for the construction of Loop 9. Because the Loop 9 roadway would require a wider right-of-way than most existing roadways in the area, including Ovilla Road, following these roadways could displace a larger number of homes and businesses. By placing Loop 9 primarily in undeveloped parcels, TxDOT can reduce the impacts to area residents and businesses.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
20				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Vansyckle is concerned about exits considered at Cockrell Hill Rd and Westmoreland Rd. Additional traffic from these exits would overwhelms the resources of Ovilla. Safety and noise are major concerns for the residents of Ovilla. Mr. Vansyckle requests that exits only be considered at Westmoreland Rd and Duncanville Rd. He also requests to be kept informed of the project.	No	Thank you for your input. Entrance and exit ramps will be determined based on TxDOT design requirements and input from city officials. All attendees to the recent public meetings have been included on the Loop 9 mailing list and will be notified when additional public involvement activities are planned.
21				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Monitto thanks TxDOT for eliminating Alignment 1. She states that the new alignment is still too close to their community and they are worried that with the development of Loop 9, they will be annexed into city limits and lose their “country rural” atmosphere. She states the Bear Creek Rd needs attention from TxDOT.	No	Thank you for your comment. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies. Annexation by local municipalities and development along the corridor are outside the purview of TxDOT. Development along the Loop 9 corridor will be guided by the local municipalities and they are able to provide information on how zoning ordinances and land use guidelines may affect adjacent lands.
22				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Malec prefers Alignment B because it has the least impact on his land. He has a great life on his farm and requests that TxDOT not take his land from him.	No	Thank you for your input. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
23				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Malec provided additional comments on the study area maps provided for this purpose at the meeting. He asks why another toll road is needed, who will benefit from it and who will own it. He reiterates that Alignment C would greatly impact his property and that he prefers Alignment B (between US 67 and Westmoreland Dr).	Yes	Tolling is under consideration as a funding mechanism for the construction of Loop 9. The roadway would be under public ownership and the management and maintenance of the roadway could be the responsibility of NTTA or another company. TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
24				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Paxton asks whether consideration has been given to aligning Loop 9 with Ovilla Road where possible in order to reduce construction costs.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
25				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. DeVall requests that the Loop 9 project be stopped.	No	TxDOT appreciates your input. The current Feasibility/Corridor Study will be completed in the fall and at that time determinations will be made on what sections of the Loop 9 roadway can be moved forward. It may be determined that some portions of Loop 9 are not feasible and cannot be constructed in the near term.
26				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Monitto does not believe he has enough facts about the project to form an adequate opinion. He requests that the money for Loop 9 be used to repair local highways and arterial streets like Bear Creek.	No	As the Loop 9 project progresses, new information will be available on the loop9.org website. TxDOT encourages you to review the website on a regular basis. Also, additional public meetings will be held in Fall 2013 to present the preferred corridor for the Loop 9 project. Notices concerning these meetings will be mailed and emailed to adjacent property owners and those who have provided their information, as well as, published in local and regional newspapers.
27				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. McBurney requests a map of the Loop 9 project like what was presented on the tables at the Public Meeting. She states that area residents come to Combine City Hall asking about the project and she would like to have something displayed.	No	The information presented at the public meeting is available on the project website www.loop9.org.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
28				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	Yes	Mr. Owens requests that a decision be made quickly on the location of Loop 9. The previous alignments affected his 100 acres and he is ok with that, but he does not like the uncertainty of the project. He would like to see resolution on the location.	No	The Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study will be completed in Fall 2013 and additional public meetings will be held at that time to present the preferred Loop 9 corridor. The outcome of the Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study will be a Program of Projects that identifies specific sections of Loop 9 that can move forward into the preliminary design and environmental analysis phase of the project. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies. Once specific sections are established, a preliminary schedule for environmental clearance, right-of-way acquisition and beginning construction will be established.
29				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	Yes	Mr. Rieke states his support for the project. He supported the previous Alignment 2, but will support whatever choice is made. He believes Texas needs to move people and products to remain competitive with other states.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
30				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	The commenter does not like the Loop 9 project.	No	Thank you for your comment.
31				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Miles requests the project remain as it is presented.	Yes	Thank you for your comment. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
32				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Gerloff requests that Loop 9 follow Malloy Bridge Rd to avoid elevation costs.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
33				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Garcia asks if TxDOT will pay for the depreciation of land value and pay for a noise barrier? He also states that he does not want Loop 9 near his house.	Yes	<p>All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided.</p> <p>A noise analysis will be conducted as part of the environmental analysis phase. If a noise barrier is determined to be reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers.</p> <p>Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.</p>

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
34				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Ms. Garcia states that her house is within one of the alternate routes (previous Alt 2) and close to the current alignment (D3). She asks if TxDOT will offer a depreciated value for purchased land. Also, she requests TxDOT build a noise barrier if the roadway is close to her home.	Yes	<p>All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided.</p> <p>Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.</p> <p>A noise analysis will be conducted as part of the environmental analysis phase. If a noise barrier is determined to be reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers.</p>
35				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Gilbreath requests TxDOT follow Alignment B (between US 67 and Westmoreland Rd) because Alignment C would cut through his property and everything he has built on that land.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
36				5/16/2013	Public Meeting - Ferris	No	No	No	Mr. Deinhart identified his property on the study area maps provided at the meeting and indicates that a potential extension of Ovilla Road/FM 664 could extend northwest along his property and intersect with Loop 9.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
37				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Edwards requests that the maps show more land to the north so that she can see where her property is in relation to the proposed corridor. She would like more information on the purchase of her lot and does not understand the maps well. She would like more information and requests to be contacted via email or phone.	No	The maps on display at the meetings encompassed the entire area affected by the proposed Loop 9 project. If Ms. Edwards was unable to view her property on the map, her property would not be purchased for right-of-way.
38				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Jungmen lives on Cockrell Hill Rd not far from Bear Creek and requests that Cockrell Hill Rd not be an entrance ramp for Loop 9.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
39				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Khammash prefers Alignment E (between Westmoreland Rd and SH 342) and requests access to her property from the frontage road. Her property is bound by Bear Creek, Reindeer Rd, Houston School Rd and Mink Rd.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
40				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Khammash prefers Alignment E (between Westmoreland Rd and SH 342).	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
41				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	Yes	Mr. Stone requests any available details regarding the alignment between Ferris Rd and the proposed split of alignments G & H. The intersections within D4 are of particular interest to him. He lists three questions: 1. Are any provisions being considered to buffer noise? 2. Is it possible that the proposed ramps for Ferris Rd might move to another road? 3. When will ROW acquisitions be discussed with landowners?	No	Thank you for your input. Entrance and exit ramps will be determined based on TxDOT design requirements and input from city officials.
42				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	Yes	Mr. Moss requests to be placed on the mailing list.	No	Mr. Moss has been added to the mailing list.
43				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	Yes	Ms. George requests to be placed on the mailing list.	No	Mr. George has been added to the mailing list.
44				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Harrington states that the new alignment from US 67 to I-35E is an improvement over the previous alignment. Alignment A is less disruptive than previous alignments. He also requests that D1 be placed south of the subdivision at Ranch Dr. Finally, he requests information on how the new alignments will affect the City of Midlothian thoroughfare plans.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
45				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Hanson supports the Loop 9 project and would like construction to begin as soon as possible.	No	Thank you for your input.
46				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. James expresses her dissatisfaction with TxDOT because of the uncertainty related to the location of Loop 9. She lives in the Skyline Addition near US 67 and Shiloh Rd and previously was told that Loop 9 would go through her neighborhood. Now she has been told it will not and this uncertainty has been stressful. She is upset with the lack of current information available during the entire project.	No	Thank you for your comment. Due to the magnitude of the proposed project, the funding needs, and the numerous entities involved, moving the proposed project forward is a large endeavor to which TxDOT and NCTCOG are committed. TxDOT understands the frustrations of area residents and will strive to keep the public informed at each step of the process. The Program of Projects which will be identified at the end of this Study will allow the project to move forward more quickly than in the past.
47				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Dillard states that if Loop 9 is important to future transportation needs, then the project needs to move forward. The lack of certainty has kept him from improving his property and he would like to be able to move on with future investments.	No	Thank you for your comment. Due to the magnitude of the proposed project, the funding needs, and the numerous entities involved, moving the proposed project forward is a large endeavor to which TxDOT and NCTCOG are committed. TxDOT understands the frustrations of area residents and will strive to keep the public informed at each step of the process. The Program of Projects which will be identified at the end of this study would allow the project to move forward.
48				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Bush does not support the Loop 9 project. She believes the construction of Loop 9 would cause Ovilla to lose its “small town” feel and would negatively affect the wildlife present in the community. She does not see any benefit to Loop 9.	No	Thank you for your input.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
49				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Gibson is concerned with the additional traffic Loop 9 would bring the Lake Ridge Pkwy. There are no lights along Lake Ridge Pkwy and Mr. Gibson is concerned that motorists would cut through the neighborhood to access SH 360. He believes this would lead to lower property values in this area. Also, new hike and bike trails are being constructed along Lake Ridge Pkwy and the additional traffic could make the area dangerous for those using the trails.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
50				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Pinell believes immediate traffic needs in the area are along north-south roadways and these warrant short-term solutions. He does not understand the need for Loop 9; however, Alignment B would be preferable. He reiterates that the proposed Loop 9 does not make sense with the current traffic needs.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
51				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	Yes	Mr. Deison owns 70 acres east of Westmoreland Rd and south of Bear Creek along Alignments D1 and D2. He requests that the first phase of the Loop 9 highway be placed within the southern portion of the corridor in order to provide access to his property.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
52				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	Yes	Mr. Deison provided the same comment and identified the limits of his land on the study area maps provided for this purpose at the meeting.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
53				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. McFadden is disappointed that each iteration of this project has required more of his land. The current proposal will displace him entirely while the 2004 and 2009 alignments did not. He states that property owners should have input on where the alignment falls within their land. He states that the proposed project is a disaster for him, his family and his employees.	No	The goal of the Public Meetings held in May was to solicit input for local property owners about the proposed Loop 9 project. All comments will be taken into consideration as the project moves forward. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
54				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Scott lives approximately 0.5 mile south of Alignments E and F and supports whichever is more feasible. He prefers the previous Alignment 2 which would have impacted his land. He states that building the section between US 67 and I-35E first would be most beneficial.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
55				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	He is concerned about the Oncor power lines that serve his property because they would be impacted by the construction. He asks how it is determined who pays for the poles, wires, easements and right-of-way to move the lines, if required?	No	Thank you for your input. Information regarding impacts to Oncor power lines will be dependent on the final alignment. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
56				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	He appreciates the hard work of TxDOT and would like the project to be expedited.	No	Thank you for your input.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
57				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Garza is opposed to Loop 9 because he believes it is a way for TxDOT or the city to make money and there isn't a reason to construct in the area. He moved to the area to get away from the noise but this project will bring it to him. He does not want Loop 9 in her community.	No	The proposed Loop 9 project is needed to provide important east-west connectivity, reduce travel times, and support economic development opportunities in the study area. A noise analysis will be conducted as part of the environmental analysis phase. If a noise barrier is determined to be reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers.
58				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Douthit requests that the proposed Loop 9 be left as shown at the meeting because it misses his property.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
59				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	The Northerns are against Loop 9. They ask who will benefit as a result of the road because it appears the Ovilla community's peace and quiet and property values will be negatively impacted.	No	Thank you for your input.
60				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Parker does not approve of Loop 9 but if it will be built, he asks that it be built soon. Additionally, he requests that the six 90-degree turns on FM 664 between Ovilla and Waxahachie be straightened out.	No	The outcome of the Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study will be a Program of Projects that identifies specific sections of Loop 9 that can move forward into the preliminary design and environmental analysis phase of the project. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies. Once specific sections are established, a preliminary schedule for environmental clearance, right-of-way acquisition and beginning construction will be established.
61				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Scribner states that if Tar Rd is extended as identified on the map, she prefers the previous Alignment 1 for Loop 9 because it would take her entire property instead of only part of it.	No	Thank you for your input. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
62				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Thompson supports the new alignments shown at the meeting. He asks that the two Loop 9 signs posted on Tar Rd at the "previous alternatives" crossings be removed.	No	Thank you for your input.
63				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Arnold requests that TxDOT use a smaller amount of funding than is required for the Loop 9 project and upgrade the existing road network. He believes this is better for the taxpayer. What is good for the city/county is not good for citizens/voters.	No	Thank you for your input.
64				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Winchester and his family are not in favor of this project. They have remodeled their home and plan to retire, but are concerned that TxDOT will not pay a fair price for their home. They believe that using eminent domain is akin to stealing their property. Mr. Winchester states that he is too old to start over because he has to settle for what TxDOT considers a fair price.	No	All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
65	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	The Nicholas' home is in the path of Loop 9 and they are disappointed that they could be displaced with only 8 years left on their mortgage.	No	All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
66	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Strain-Burk prefers Alignment E between I-35E and SH 342.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
67	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Strain-Burk provided additional comments on the study area maps provided for this purpose at the meeting. She supports the interchange of Loop 9 at I-35E because it gives equal access to Lancaster and Red Oak. She also notes that it is a potential mass transit node and decreases impacts to local residences. Ms. Strain-Burk prefers Alignment E between I-35E and SH 342 because there is less impact on residences and it is not in the floodplain. She reminds TxDOT that they need to plan for drainage impacts to surrounding areas and allow for a potential mass transit node at the Loop 9/SH 342 intersection. Lastly, she supports Alignment D3 from SH 342 to I-45 but asks TxDOT to plan for a mass transit node because of the presence of the railroad.	Yes	Thank you for your input. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
68	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Parker states that Loop 9 was a good idea 40 years ago but now it will disrupt too many landowners. She believes TxDOT should spend money on projects that have been better planned.	No	Thank you for your input.
69	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	The Raleighs support the Loop 9 project because it will alleviate commuter traffic and increase land values.	No	Thank you for your input.
70	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Tillotson supports Alignment E near South Hampton Rd and Ferris Rd.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
71	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Ms. Mageors supports Alignment A at the intersection of US 67.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
72	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Bryant is concerned about the potential high volume of 18-wheel trucks using Loop 9 from I-35E or I-45. In the initial stage of construction with only two lanes, there would not be room to safely pass. Also, he requests service roads be implemented in order to allow growth in the area and provide easy access for gas, car trouble or wrecks.	No	Thank you for your input.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
73				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	Yes	The Molinas support Loop 9. The alignment along the Dallas/Ellis County line is directly on top of their 15-acre property.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
74				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	Yes	Mr. Molina requests to maintain Alignment A (between US 67 and Westmoreland Rd) as is.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
75				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Galbraith supports the connection to Lake Ridge Parkway.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
76				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. McMillen submitted four written comments before the Public Meeting and another comment during the Public Meeting. He is deeply concerned about the alignment displacing homes on Stone Creek in Glenn Heights. He believes the alignment could be moved to the field across the street, away from the homes and install a wall to protect the view and the houses. Additionally, Mr. McMillen suggests that TxDOT consider using the Loop 9 funding to extend SH 360 to US 287 instead.	No	The previously proposed 600-foot wide right-of-way did impact the homes on Stone Creek, but the currently proposed 350-foot wide right-of-way is contained within the field north of Stone Creek. None of the homes on Stone Creek would be impacted by the proposed project. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
77				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	The Owens do not understand why TxDOT is willing to fund the Loop 9 project when US 287 already has a wide right-of-way and could be expanded to 6 or 8 lanes between US 67 and I-45. He asks if it is because Dallas County would like the revenue from potential development around Loop 9. He believes politics is more involved in this decision than local property owners.	No	Thank you for your input. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
78				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Owen asks why Alignment D3 is so close to the houses on the south side when there is vacant pasture to the north that it could cross.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
79				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	The commenter requests that decisions regarding Loop 9 be made in a timely manner so they will know what will become of their property. As presented, Loop 9 will directly affect their property and they have been unable to improve their land because of the uncertainty of the project.	Yes	Thank you for your input.
80				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Bartels requests that Alignment D2 (between Westmoreland Rd and SH 342) be shifted to the north, away from Harmony Subdivision.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
81				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	The commenter clarified the labeling on the maps provided at the meeting. Cedar Hill Rd should not be labeled south of Mt. Lebanon Rd. This should instead be labeled at Tar Rd.	Yes	Thank you for your input.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
82				5/23/2013	Public Meeting - Ovilla	No	No	No	Mr. Lovasz requests that the entire Loop 9 project be moved south of Waxahachie.	Yes	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
83				5/17/2013	Mail	No	No	No	<u>Corridor Location</u> - Initial proposal of Loop 9 occurred when area was less populated and it should now be moved further south. - It is possible politicians in the initial planning stages chose the study area based on their personal connections.	No	TxDOT provided a response to Mr. Rudd’s letter on May 20, 2013 inviting Mr. Rudd to the May 23rd Public Meeting and clarifying information from Mr. Rudd’s letter that was based on the previous version of the Loop 9 project. The following items respond to each specific statement in Mr. Rudd’s letter. Corridor Location • The Loop 9 Study Area was established in XXXX based on population and traffic projections. Moving the study area to a new area would require the project to start over and all analyses done and data gathered would be unusable. In order to maintain the project’s momentum and capitalize on all the work done over the years, the study area and the proposed corridors will remain north of Waxahachie. • While local cities and counties have been involved in the planning stages of the proposed project, the need for the project stems from increasing populations, congested roadways, and the lack of sufficient east-west corridors in southern Dallas and northern Ellis Counties.
84				5/17/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Tolling - Does not agree with the possibility of tolling – development control will be lost, no accountability to citizens of the community, only profit-centered entity. - A toll road will be a financial burden on the public for years to come. - If traffic numbers do not support the contracted traffic flow, the taxpayer will have to pay. Only one toll road in North Texas makes a profit. - Toll road are not popular with the public. - Requires signing non-compete clause which would prohibit additional roadways being built within a certain distance of Loop 9. - Received a letter from Governor Perry’s office indicating that a toll road would require voter approval and he believes this letter would not have been sent if it were not true.	No	• Due to large state transportation budget needs, tolling is always considered as a source of funding on large roadway projects. No decision has been made on the potential use of tolling on the proposed Loop 9 roadway.
85				5/17/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Route would be a hazardous cargo highway, burdening local taxpayers with enforcement personnel and equipment.	No	Loop 9 is not planned as a hazardous cargo route.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
86				5/17/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Skyline Subdivision- The route around US 67 removes an expensive communication tower, a subdivision and several businesses. The subdivision that would be impacted is an older community who have lived in their homes for 20 – 30 years and enjoy taking care of their community.- There is space available north of the subdivision on the Dallas/Ellis County line for an interchange and this has been presented at previous meetings. Skyline Acres has been platted since the 1950s.- Moving the alignment north of Skyline would be less expensive, would preserve a neighborhood and would keep legal expenses low related to land acquisition.	No	During the environmental analysis phase of the Loop 9 project, wildlife habitat/vegetation assessment and threatened/endangered species survey would be conducted to identify any impacts to these resources.
87				5/17/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Environmental Impacts - Woodlands include eagles, cougar, redbirds, cardinals, blue jays, black capped vireo, golden cheeked warblers, bluebirds, mockingbirds and hummingbirds. No impact studies have been done to determine impacts to these animals. - There are already pollutants in the air from three cement factories. Increasing the carbon dioxide could exponentially worsen the air quality.	No	The majority of the project is within Dallas County. The corridor passes through Ellis County in certain locations in order to bypass existing neighborhoods or other important features.
88				5/17/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Planner (Hunt) Development Studies - Three studies, including Loop 9, Southern Gateway and Envision Midlothian have involved Hunt and present three different concepts for the US 67 and Shiloh area. DART is shown within these plans but no one in Ellis County supports the presence of DART. - Believes this project should be investigated by the U.S. Justice Department because too many decision-makers are tied to Hunt.	No	Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
89				5/17/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Project should stay in Dallas County.	No	Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
90				5/17/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The plans for the Loop 9/US 67 interchange should be altered.	No	Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
91				5/21/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Hancock supports Alternative 2 near Houston School Road. He has been unable to sell part of his land because Loop 9 was proposed to pass through it. The southern Alternative 2 would relieve him and his neighbors of this burden.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
92	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/21/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Olsen voices his frustration that a decision has not been made regarding the alignment of Loop 9. He owned approximately 135 acres of land and has only been able to sell half because of the potential presence of Loop 9 on the southern half of his land. He requests that TxDOT make a decision on the location and either buy his land or remove his land from their exhibits. He provided a NCTCOG exhibit that shows his land and the previous Loop 9 design.	No	A decision regarding the preferred corridor alignment for the Loop 9 project will be made at the end of the Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study. This study and the ultimate decision should be completed in Fall 2013. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
93	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/24/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Greenberg has attended Loop 9 meetings since 1983 and he suggests that Loop 9 follow Ovilla Road. He states that it can take 15 minutes to get from Ovilla to Red Oak which is too long for the distance traveled.	No	Because the Loop 9 roadway would require a wider right-of-way than most existing roadways in the area, including Ovilla Road, following these roadways could displace a larger number of homes and businesses. By placing Loop 9 primarily in undeveloped parcels, TxDOT can reduce the impacts to area residents and businesses.
94	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/24/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Jones does not believe there is a need for Loop 9 because Ovilla Road will be improved to 4-6 lanes in the near future. He suggests that TxDOT use Loop 9 funds to build a new road between US 67 and Ovilla Road and to improve north-south roadways like Westmoreland, Cockrell Hill, etc.	No	The proposed Loop 9 corridor and expanded Ovilla Rd facility serve different purposes and needs. The need for the proposed Loop 9 project is to provide important east-west connectivity, reduce travel times, and support economic development opportunities in the study area. The expansion of Ovilla Rd is needed to address congestion, growing traffic volumes, and safety concerns.
95	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/24/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Soroka believes that TxDOT ignores the written comments provided by the public and that the public meetings are only to inform the affected people how and when they will negatively impacted.	No	Each written comment is analyzed and considered as part of the Loop 9 project. TxDOT, NCTCOG, and the study team are preparing responses for each comment as part of a Public Meeting Report which will be available through the TxDOT Dallas Area Office.
96	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/25/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Ham believes there is no need for Loop 9. US 287 and I-20 more than adequately serve the east-west needs of the area. He states that the proposed Loop 9 will require land and homes form area residents solely for the profit of foreign entities and this is deplorable.	No	The studies done so far on the proposed Loop 9 facility have focused on reducing impacts to area residents. The current alignments and right-of-way width have reduced impacts from what was proposed just a few years ago. No foreign entities are involved in the planning of the Loop 9 project.
97	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/28/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Lucy prefers the new alignment with the narrower right-of-way although he would prefer the right-of-way be reduced even more. Also, he would like to see US 67 and I-20 widened with their existing rights-of-way.	No	Thank you for your input.
98	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	5/29/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Burn requests that Loop 9 be aligned north of Skyline Landfill in order to reduce current and future operations of the facility. One-third of the city's budget is supported by the Host Fees collected from the facility. The current alignment encroaches on the landfill and would reduce the area available for landfill material.	No	Thank you for your input. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
99				5/30/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Clements is curious as to whether this study is truly studying whether this roadway will alleviate traffic congestion or if it is just a continuation of the past 45 years’ worth of studies. These studies have been supported through taxpayer dollars and he wonders if the cost has been worth the effort. He hopes that the money received through tolling the roadway will go to repay the effort spent on the various studies of Loop 9. Also, he asks why this route was chosen and whether upgrading the existing loops could provide the same benefit. He feels the studies done so far have only been about where to put Loop 9 and not whether there is a need for Loop 9.	No	<p>The need for the proposed Loop 9 project is to provide important east-west connectivity, reduce travel times, and support economic development opportunities in the study area. The existing east-west arterial roadways do not provide adequate carrying capacity and there are no highways in the immediate vicinity. It is anticipated that traffic conditions will worsen as the area continues to grow in population and commercial/industrial development.</p> <p>Because the Loop 9 roadway would require a wider right-of-way than most existing roadways in the area, following these roadways could displace a larger number of homes and businesses. By placing Loop 9 primarily in undeveloped parcels, TxDOT can reduce the impacts to area residents and businesses.</p>
100				5/30/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Witzgall believes the money for this roadway would be better spent on maintaining existing roadways. His experience driving on I-20, I-35E and US 67 indicates that an additional road is not necessary because he can reach 70 mph on southbound I-35E during rush hour. He suggests using the funds for this project on relief efforts in Johnson County related to the recent tornados.	No	Thank you for your input.
101				5/29/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Karpenko-Caywood requests that Loop 9 be moved further south into Ellis County and surrounding counties so that they can share the cost, benefit and maintenance of the roadway. She believes this will be a more cost-effective way around residential development, natural areas, parks and Joe Pool Lake. She prefers the previous Alignment 1 from US 67 to Alternative C/D. She is concerned that additional service roads and interchanges will need to be built, increasing the right-of-way to 1,000 feet. She believes this will lead to zoned commercial areas and lower property values of homeowners. She requests that a connection to US 287 is considered.	No	Thank you for your input. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
102	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Email	No	No	No	The Dubois provided nine reasons why they oppose the Loop 9 project. In summary, these include the negative impacts on their property (financial loss, noise, pollution and zoning changes), an outdated feasibility study, impacts to senior citizens and minority groups, low traffic projections for the area do not support the project, the I-20/US 67 area is not listed on TxDOT's top 100 most congested roadways, seeking a route to the south along existing rights-of-way appears more financially feasible, existing highways could be improved to handle east-west movements in the area, and the impetus for this project is politically motivated to support the Inland Port in Lancaster but traffic projections do not indicate a rise in traffic from the port. Finally, the Dubois request that TxDOT expand the feasibility study to include areas to the south where they believe land prices would be lower, there is more anticipated growth and congestion and identified senior citizen and minority groups would not be affected.	No	A noise analysis will be conducted as part of the environmental analysis phase. If a noise barrier is determined to be reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers. Land use and zoning are determined by local municipalities. Landowners should discuss their concerns/desires for properties adjacent to the proposed corridor with their local officials. The proposed Loop 9 project will be subject to all federal laws and regulations which include Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." TxDOT's goal on every project is to limit impacts to area residents, including senior citizens and minority populations. Because the Loop 9 roadway would require a wider right-of-way than most existing roadways in the area, following these roadways could displace a larger number of homes. By placing Loop 9 primarily in undeveloped parcels, TxDOT can reduce the impacts to area residents and businesses.
103	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Hogans provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9. In addition, they believe an east-west roadway is unnecessary and there is no congestion in the area to support it. They state that the project is based on the expansion of the Panama Canal and the need to move imported goods to the Inland Port and that TxDOT should not be supporting trade movements. They request TxDOT focus on maintaining existing roadways and urban congestion instead of impacting a rural area. They express concern on maintaining a two-lane road with the potential increase in weight limits on large trucks. Finally, they believe the project is politically motivated to benefit elected officials.	No	<p>A noise analysis will be conducted as part of the environmental analysis phase. If a noise barrier is determined to be reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers.</p> <p>Land use and zoning are determined by local municipalities. Landowners should discuss their concerns/desires for properties adjacent to the proposed corridor with their local officials.</p> <p>The proposed Loop 9 project will be subject to all federal laws and regulations which include Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." TxDOT's goal on every project is to limit impacts to area residents, including senior citizens and minority populations.</p> <p>Because the Loop 9 roadway would require a wider right-of-way than most existing roadways in the area, following these roadways could displace a larger number of homes. By placing Loop 9 primarily in undeveloped parcels, TxDOT can reduce the impacts to area residents and businesses.</p>
104	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Haga provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
105	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Durbin states that her property would be affected by the Loop 9 project and she is saddened by the potential loss of her house and property. She has lived in the same location for 46 years and is a widow on Social Security; she does not believe she would be able to find a comparable place to live and cannot imagine leaving her land. Alternative E is her choice of the options because it would not affect her house.	No	Thank you for your input.
106	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	At the meeting, Ms. Durbin was told the routes were chosen based on the floodplain but her pasture floods during slow, heavy rains and her house has flooded four times in 46 years.	No	Thank you for your input.
107	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Durbin was not satisfied with how the meetings were set-up because she was not able to make it every station and get her questions answered. She preferred the meetings conducted in 2010 which had everyone, including TxDOT, seated and provided everyone with time to speak.	No	Thank you for your input. The public meetings in the fall of 2013 will include a speaking presentation.
108	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	She has concerns that TxDOT does not know when the project will start, which sections will be constructed first, and from where the funding will come. She has heard from others that the project will be owned by a European entity and that it will be a toll road. All of the unknowns leave her very confused and upset.	No	The public meetings in the fall of 2013 will include a speaking presentation and the information she requests will be made available at that time. No foreign entities are involved with the proposed Loop 9 project. If it is determined at a later date that Loop 9 could be constructed as a toll road, the North Texas Tollway Authority (NTTA) would have the first right of refusal to manage and maintain the roadway. The roadway would be under public ownership.
109	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	She looks forward to the meetings in the fall and hopes that they will be conducted like the meeting in 2010 as opposed to the recent meetings. Also, she would like to know at that time when the project will start and how families will be compensated for their land and relocation.	No	The public meetings in the fall of 2013 will include a speaking presentation and the information she requests will be made available at that time.
110	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Gerstens provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
111	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Gerstens request a review of the need for the interchange on South Duncanville Rd at Bear Creek. They believe Duncanville Rd and Cockrell Hill Rd are too close to be effective interchanges and widening Duncanville Rd to four lanes would destroy this scenic road. Also, a valuable equestrian center, housing subdivision and other homes would be affected by the interchange. They request that the interchange at Duncanville Road not be constructed.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
112	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Bells oppose Loop 9 passing through any part of Ovilla because it will be disruptive to the quiet and peaceful way of life.	No	Thank you for your input.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
113	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. England believes a “watered down” version of a roadway envisioned in 1958 is not relevant to current conditions. He believes using eminent domain to acquire properties that will benefit only a few people and possibly be subsidized by foreign entities is wrong. He suggests the improving US 287 would be more beneficial to the region.	No	No foreign entities are involved with the proposed Loop 9 project. If it is determined at a later date that Loop 9 could be constructed as a toll road, the North Texas Tollway Authority (NTTA) would have the first right of refusal to manage and maintain the roadway. The roadway would be under public ownership.
114	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Holleys provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
115	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Butler provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
116	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Browns provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
117	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Hudsons provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
118	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Haga provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
119	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Dagley provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
120	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Olivares provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
121	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Olivares provided a second comment stating her uncertainty as to who would use the proposed Loop 9, especially if it were to be tolled. She asks why her neighborhood was not invited to the meeting since it will be affected.	No	Thank you for your input. Ms. Olivares has been added to the mailing list.
122	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Terry provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
123	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Pinckney provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
124	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Anderson provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
125	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Vines provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
126	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Allen provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
127	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Horton provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
128	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Crandall provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
129	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Lackey provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
130	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Sills provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
131	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Ballew provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
132	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Adesanya provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
133	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Kenney provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
134	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Candidos provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
135	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Evans provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
136	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Hopkine provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
137	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Luna provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
138	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Serrano provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
139	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Khounphanya provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
140	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Ware provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
141	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Gjetley provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
142	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Boydston provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice her opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
143	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Mr. Boydston provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice his opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
144	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Andersons provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
145	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	The Kights provided a copy of the letter prepared by Mr. Dubois to voice their opposition to Loop 9.	No	See Response to #102.
146	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Oum states that her home will be displaced by the Loop 9 project and she is upset about the loss of her way of life. No amount of money will compensate for the loss of her home. She suggests expanding US 67 and SH 287 to improve traffic for local residents.	No	Thank you for your comment. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies.
147	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Pope attended both Public Meetings and found the number of maps available to be inadequate for the section between US 67 and Westmoreland Rd. She also wanted to view the Draft Environmental Impact Statement but it was not available. She asks who is financially responsible for the project and would like clarity on whether the road would be a public roadway or toll road, the number of lanes and the width of the right-of-way. Additionally, she asks if Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is applicable.	No	<p>The 11x17 maps available at the public meetings were for attendees to provide comments specific to the proposed alignments and not for distribution.</p> <p>The Draft Environmental Impact Statement is no longer an accurate document for this proposed project. New environmental analyses and studies will be conducted based on the reduced right-of-way width and shifted alignment.</p> <p>It is anticipated that construction will be funded by regional, state and federal money. It is possible there would be a tolling component to the Loop 9 facility but this has not been determined. At the completion of the Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study, a Program of Projects will be created that identifies which portions of Loop 9 are feasible to continue forward into the preliminary design and environmental assessment phase. Once the preliminary design begins, the right-of-way needs and number of lanes would be identified. Preliminary/final design and final alignment determinations will be made during subsequent environmental studies. Title VI of the Civil Right Act applies to all federally-funded projects and the impact of the proposed project on minority and low-income individuals would be assessed to determine if it is disproportionately high and adverse.</p>
148	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Pope states that Alternative A would displace 11 homes on Knight St and indicates that properties behind these homes are for sale and could be used instead. She also suggests Alternative B would be a better choice because portions of this area have been on the market for a long time. Finally, Alternative C would not be ideal for constructing a roadway because of the presence of stock ponds, floodplain and creeks.	No	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – May 2013 Public Meetings

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	Map Comments?	TxDOT Response
149				6/3/2013	Mail	No	No	No	Ms. Pope had heard that the Loop 9 project will connect to Lake Ridge Pkwy, extend across Joe Pool Lake, connect to SH 161 and be owned by the United Arab Emirates as a toll road. She requests that TxDOT turn their attention to other roadways such as US 67.	No	The Loop 9 project would end at US 67. The current alignment does connect to Lake Ridge Parkway, but the project would not extend past US 67. Additionally, no foreign entities are involved with the proposed Loop 9 project. If it is determined at a later date that Loop 9 could be constructed as a toll road, the North Texas Tollway Authority (NTTA) would have the first right of refusal to manage and maintain the roadway. The roadway would be under public ownership.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – September 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	TxDOT Response
1				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Airport Improvement Issues	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project.
2				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Concern Regarding Impacts to Home, Property, Neighborhood, Subdivision, and Potential Relocation	All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.
3				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	*Access Concerns *Potential Noise Impacts to Residents	*Existing local access will be maintained with the proposed project and access to cross streets would be determined based on TxDOT design guidelines. Control of access will be determined during the preliminary design phase. *During the development of the environmental document for each section of Loop 9 a noise analysis will be conducted. If it is determined that a noise barrier is reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers. A meeting would be held with adjacent property owners to discuss the barrier.
4				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Concern Regarding Impacts to Home, Property, Neighborhood, Subdivision, and Potential Relocation	All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.
5				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Widen Existing Roadways in the Area	Currently there is approximately \$100 million in funding set aside specifically for the Loop 9 project. Other improvements in the area are ongoing and each have a separate set of funding available for those projects. Because the Loop 9 roadway would require a wider right-of-way than most existing roadways in the area, following these roadways could displace a larger number of homes and businesses. By placing Loop 9 primarily in undeveloped parcels, TxDOT can reduce the impacts to area residents and businesses.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – September 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	TxDOT Response
6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	*Does Not Support the Project *Concerned about Protecting Natural Resources Concern Regarding Impacts to Home, Property, Neighborhood, Subdivision, and Potential Relocation	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *During the initial identification of alternative alignments, known ecological resources were identified as “no-go” areas for the proposed Loop 9 corridor. As the project moves forward into the environmental document phase and additional information is collected, impacts to these resources will be assessed and avoided and/or mitigated, as necessary. TxDOT is using public involvement activities such as these public meetings to identify important resources in the study area so that these resources can be protected from the proposed roadway. *All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.
7	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	*Access Concerns *Potential Noise Impacts to Residents	*Existing local access will be maintained with the proposed project and access to cross streets would be determined based on TxDOT design guidelines. Control of access will be determined during the preliminary design phase. *During the development of the environmental document for each section of Loop 9 a noise analysis will be conducted. If it is determined that a noise barrier is reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers. A meeting would be held with adjacent property owners to discuss the barrier.
8	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	Yes	*Supports the Project *Supports Specific Alignment	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
9	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Support/Oppose Specific Alignment	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
10	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	*Does Not Support the Project *Loss of Rural Feeling *Concern Regarding Impacts to Home, Property, Neighborhood, Subdivision, and Potential Relocation	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – September 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	TxDOT Response
										property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.
11				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Airport Non-Issue	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project.
12				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Concerns Regarding Changes in Existing Thoroughfare Designations After Loop 9 Implementation	TxDOT and NCTCOG will be committed to resolving thoroughfare designation issues on a case by case basis.
13				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	*Does Not Support the Project *Feels Project is Politically Motivated	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *While local cities and counties have been involved in the planning stages of the proposed project, the need for the project stems from increasing populations, congested roadways, and the lack of sufficient east-west corridors in southern Dallas and northern Ellis Counties. The proposed Loop 9 project is included in Mobility 2035: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas – 2013 Update.
14				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	*Does Not Support the Project *Concern Regarding Impacts to Home, Property, Neighborhood, Subdivision, and Potential Relocation	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.
15				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	Support/Oppose Specific Interchange	Existing local access will be maintained with the proposed project and access to cross streets would be determined based on TxDOT design guidelines. Control of access will be determined during the preliminary design phase.
16				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	Requests Shift to Proposed Alternatives	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study. The Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study Area was established in 2012 based on population and traffic projections. Moving the study area to a new area would require that the project start over and all data gathered and analyses conducted to date would be unusable. To maintain the project's momentum and capitalize on all of the work performed over the years, the study area and the proposed corridors will remain as currently presented.
17				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	Support/Oppose Specific Alignment	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
18				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	Support/Oppose Specific Interchange	Existing local access will be maintained with the proposed project and access to cross streets would be determined based on TxDOT

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – September 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	TxDOT Response
										design guidelines. Control of access will be determined during the preliminary design phase.
19				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	Support/Oppose Specific Interchange	Existing local access will be maintained with the proposed project and access to cross streets would be determined based on TxDOT design guidelines. Control of access will be determined during the preliminary design phase.
20				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	Concern Regarding Impacts to Home, Property, Neighborhood, Subdivision, and Potential Relocation	All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.
21				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	Requests Shift to Proposed Alternatives	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study. The Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study Area was established in 2012 based on population and traffic projections. Moving the study area to a new area would require that the project start over and all data gathered and analyses conducted to date would be unusable. To maintain the project's momentum and capitalize on all of the work performed over the years, the study area and the proposed corridors will remain as currently presented.
22				9/26/2013	email - TxDOT	No	No	No	Supports the Project	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project.
23				9/30/2013	Mail - TxDOT	No	No	No	*Supports Specific Alignment *Support of Tolling	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study. *Due to large state transportation budget needs, tolling is always considered as a source of funding on large roadway projects. The Regional Transportation Council has a policy to evaluate all new limited-access capacity facilities for priced facility potential. No decision has been made on the potential use of tolling on the proposed Loop 9 roadway. The proposed Loop 9 project is included in Mobility 2035: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas – 2013 Update.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – September 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	TxDOT Response
24				9/30/2013	Mail - TxDOT	No	No	No	*Supports the Project *Frustrated with the Lengthiness of the Study	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *Due to the magnitude of the proposed project, the funding needs, and the numerous entities involved, moving the proposed project forward is a large endeavor to which TxDOT and NCTCOG are committed. TxDOT understands the frustrations of area residents and will strive to keep the public informed at each step of the process. The Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study will be completed in fall 2013. The outcome of the Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study will be a Program of Projects that identifies specific sections of Loop 9 that can move forward into the preliminary design and environmental analysis phase of the project. After specific sections are established, a preliminary schedule for environmental clearance, right-of-way acquisition and beginning construction will be established. The Program of Projects, which will be identified at the end of this study, would allow the project to move forward more quickly than in the past. The Program of Projects will identify specific sections of Loop 9 to move forward into the preliminary design and environmental analysis phase of the project. After specific sections are established, a preliminary schedule for environmental clearance, right-of-way acquisition and beginning construction will be established.
25				9/30/2013	Mail - TxDOT	No	No	No	*Does Not Support the Project*Requests Shift to Proposed Alternatives	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed corridors and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study. The Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study Area was established in 2012 based on population and traffic projections. Moving the study area to a new area would require that the project start over and all data gathered and analyses conducted to date would be unusable. To maintain the project's momentum and capitalize on all of the work performed over the years, the study area and the proposed corridors will remain as currently presented.
26				10/4/2013	Mail - TxDOT	No	No	No	*Concern Regarding Impacts to Home, Property, Neighborhood, Subdivision, and Potential Relocation *Potential Noise Impacts to Residents	*All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared. *During the development of the environmental document for each section of Loop 9 a noise analysis will be conducted. If it is determined that a noise barrier is reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers. A meeting would be held

Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – September 2013 Public Meetings

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	TxDOT Response
										with adjacent property owners to discuss the barrier.
27				10/6/2013	email - Loop9.org	No	No	No	*Does Not Support the Project*Frustrated with the Lengthiness of the Study*Support of Mass Transit*Widen Existing Roadways in the Area	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *Due to the magnitude of the proposed project, the funding needs, and the numerous entities involved, moving the proposed project forward is a large endeavor to which TxDOT and NCTCOG are committed. TxDOT understands the frustrations of area residents and will strive to keep the public informed at each step of the process. The Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study will be completed in fall 2013. The outcome of the Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study will be a Program of Projects that identifies specific sections of Loop 9 that can move forward into the preliminary design and environmental analysis phase of the project. After specific sections are established, a preliminary schedule for environmental clearance, right-of-way acquisition and beginning construction will be established. The Program of Projects, which will be identified at the end of this study, would allow the project to move forward more quickly than in the past. The Program of Projects will identify specific sections of Loop 9 to move forward into the preliminary design and environmental analysis phase of the project. After specific sections are established, a preliminary schedule for environmental clearance, right-of-way acquisition and beginning construction will be established.*TxDOT and the NCTCOG support an improved and expanded public transportation network within the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Area. These services are provided by numerous transit-focused organizations throughout the region. The NCTCOG’s recommendations and policies pertaining to public transportation can be found in Mobility 2035: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas – 2013 Update. Once the Program of Projects identifies specific sections of Loop 9 to move forward into the preliminary design and environmental analysis phase of the project, TxDOT will coordinate with local municipalities, counties and transit authorities to establish the locations of proposed/planned transit projects in the proposed project area.*Currently there is approximately \$100 million in funding set aside specifically for the Loop 9 project. Other improvements in the area are ongoing and each have a separate set of funding available for those projects. Because the Loop 9 roadway would require a wider right-of-way than most existing roadways in the area, following these roadways could displace a larger number of homes and businesses. By placing Loop 9 primarily in undeveloped parcels, TxDOT can reduce the impacts to area residents and businesses.

**Loop 9 Southeast Corridor/Feasibility Study
Comments – September 2013 Public Meetings**

#	Commenter Name	Affiliation	Address	Date Received	Where Comment was Received	Employed by TxDOT	Do Business with TxDOT	Could Benefit Monetarily or Other	Comment	TxDOT Response
28				10/7/2013	email - Loop9.org	No	No	No	*Concern about Protecting Natural Resources *Requests Shift to Proposed Alternatives *Access Concerns	*During the initial identification of alternative alignments, known ecological resources were identified as “no-go” areas for the proposed Loop 9 corridor. As the project moves forward into the environmental document phase and additional information is collected, impacts to these resources will be assessed and avoided and/or mitigated, as necessary. TxDOT is using public involvement activities such as these public meetings to identify important resources in the study area so that these resources can be protected from the proposed roadway. *TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study. The Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study Area was established in 2012 based on population and traffic projections. Moving the study area to a new area would require that the project start over and all data gathered and analyses conducted to date would be unusable. To maintain the project’s momentum and capitalize on all of the work performed over the years, the study area and the proposed corridors will remain as currently presented. *Existing local access will be maintained with the proposed project and access to cross streets would be determined based on TxDOT design guidelines. Control of access will be determined during the preliminary design phase.
29				10/2/2013	Mail - TxDOT	No	No	No	Does Not Support the Project	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project.
30				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Concern Regarding Impacts to Home, Property, Neighborhood, Subdivision, and Potential Relocation	All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.
31				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	*Supports the Project *Supports Specific Alignment	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final corridor is made. The final determination of the project alignment will be made during a future environmental study.
32				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	*Does Not Support the Project *Concern About Involvement of Foreign Entities	*TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project. *No foreign entities are involved with the proposed Loop 9 project. If it is determined at a later date that Loop 9 could be constructed as a toll road, the North Texas Tollway Authority (NTTA) would have the first right of refusal to manage and maintain the roadway. The roadway would be under public ownership.
33				9/24/2013	Lancaster Elementary School	No	No	No	Does Not Support the Project	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project.
34				9/26/2013	Red Oak Intermediate School	No	No	No	Supports the Project	TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the proposed project.