

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 358

From: mestratton@verizon.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-14-2013 01:52 PM

Mark
Stratton
HOUSTON, TX, 77059
mestratton@verizon.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I am for options 3 and 3c, 7 or 8. I oppose options 4, 5, 6.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 359

From: wim1500@aol.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-20-2013 01:03 AM

Sharon Cho
4045 North Freeway
Houston, TX 77022
wim1500@aol.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Segment 1, alt 5. Segment 2, alt 10. Segment 3, alt 10.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 360

From: kyle.baier@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-20-2013 11:27 AM

Kyle Baier
17336 Deep Woods Dr.
Conroe, TX 77302
kyle.baier@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Why did you take out the tunnels? Why would you ask for public comments if you're going to completely disregard them? Could you at least depress the highways instead of building elevated highways everywhere?

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 361

From: armon.irones@ridemetro.org
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-20-2013 12:12 PM

Armon Irones
1900 Main Street
Houston, Texas 77002
armon.irones@ridemetro.org
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Hello I work for METRO and I attended the public meeting at Aldine High School on 11-14-13. I would like to know could you give me an estimated number of attendance for each meeting? Thank you and have a great day.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 362

From: anton@eadohouston.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 11-20-2013 12:20 PM

Anton Sinkewich
1121 Delano
Houston
anton@eadohouston.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I strongly oppose Segment 3 Alternatives 11 and 12. These proposals as shown would have devastating effects on the communities on either side of what is currently the 59 alignment by making a bad overpass condition even worse. These are terrible and cheap solutions to add capacity. This could be done in a more positive way by depressing the section of 59, adding the 45 capacity on a high flyover above and bridging the at grade street intersections. such a solution could allow for a reintroduction of Hamilton street to act as a coupling with Chartres to improve access and circulation on the east side for Downtown and East of Downtown.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 363

From: maribel.torres@bglp.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 11-20-2013 12:35 PM

Maribel Torres
1003 Gale Street
Houston, TX 77009
maribel.torres@bglp.com
Employed = False
Business = True
Benefit = False

My comment/question refers to the expansion of the 610-Hardy Toll into downtown. One thing that is not clear is what streets will this expansion be affecting? Will this be affecting only Elyisian Street or will Hardy Street property be also acquired? Most of the maps that show the expansion don't show what streets it will be using. Thank you, Maribel Torres

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 364

From: anton@eadohouston.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-20-2013 03:10 PM

Anton Sinkewich
1121 Delano
Houston
anton@eadohouston.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I strongly oppose Segment 3 Alternatives 11 and 12. These proposals as shown would have devastating effects on the communities on either side of what is currently the 59 alignment by making a bad overpass condition even worse. These are terrible and cheap solutions to add capacity. This could be done in a more positive way by depressing the section of 59, adding the 45 capacity on a high flyover above and bridging the at grade street intersections. such a solution could allow for a reintroduction of Hamilton street to act as a coupling with Chartres to improve access and circulation on the east side for Downtown and East of Downtown.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 365

From: matthew_broussard@hctx.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-20-2013 05:29 PM

Matt Broussard
956 Teetshorn
Houston, TX 77009
matthew_broussard@hctx.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I am a resident of the Woodland Heights subdivision which directly abuts the 610 to I10 portion of the improvement area. I am concerned that TXDOT removed Alternative 14 and 15 from this section without public comment or input. Widening I45 in this section will affect quality of life and property values for homeowners on both sides of I45. A tunnel option should be considered and discussed. Our historic neighborhood is bordered by Woodland Park, one of the oldest parks in Houston and historic to boot. Widening the freeway would further impact use of this park. Also, removed option 15 which shunts more traffic to the Hardy Toll road. My concern is that many of the people who use this corridor don't pay county or city taxes to maintain this roadway. I would rather increase capacity through the use of tolls or bury the roadway where the noise and pollution won't drive down our property value. Also, does TXDOT consider use of mass transit in any way in planning? Transportation should include commuter rail, not just highways. On the positive side, I am pleased to see TXDOT is considering shunting traffic off of Pierce Elevated

portion of I45 onto 59, and convert it to a parkway (Section 3, alternative 11). Houston already has two beautiful parkways (Memorial and Allen) which provide easy access to downtown. All sections of the Pierce Elevated section of highway are a traffic and safety nightmare. I take my life in my hands whenever getting onto or off of that section of freeway. It also mars on of our best views of the downtown skyline from the parkspace along Eleanor Tinsley Park and Buffalo Bayou, and creates an eyesore for many potentially useable and beautiful areas west of downtown (retail and recreation). TXDOT should consider tunneling under 59 rather than simply building up and out. The tunneling could be done while the current infrastructure continues to be used, then the Pierce elevated could be torn down and repurposed. Residential would boom along such a parkway.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 366

From: superiggy@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-20-2013 11:49 PM

Iggy Wong
4045 North Freeway #416
Houston, TX 77022
superiggy@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

segment 1 I support alt 7. taking ROW ALL from East or West is not fair to anyone.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 367

From: tgattis@pdq.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-21-2013 08:22 AM

Tory Gattis
2000 Bagby St # 7442
Houston, TX 77002
tgattis@pdq.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

An alternative to consider: There are two extended, elevated 3-lane wide N and S entrance/exit ramps along 45 just south of downtown. Could those simply be extended as express lanes through downtown, whether elevated above the Pierce or going around the east side, then reconnecting into 45 north of downtown? With that much express 45 traffic diverted, then the existing downtown mixmaster tangle of lanes/entrances/exits/elevateds could be left alone while having the congestion relieved. Thank you for your time and consideration, -Tory Gattis Editor, Houston Strategies blog

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 368

From: sockial@vcu.edu
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-21-2013 09:40 AM

Adam Socki
750 Seafoam
Houston, Texas, 77062
sockial@vcu.edu
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Please do not expand this section of the road. What we need is more public transit options to deal with congestion.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 369

From: rkchundru@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-23-2013 02:43 PM

ravi chundru
102 quitman st #405
houston, tx 77009
rkchundru@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

my interest is with segment 2 and 3; the alternatives to create elevated lanes is desirable IF the noise level can be reduced for adjacent private properties by perhaps an abundance of greenery/trees along the sides of the elevated lanes; otherwise I would much rather prefer widening the existing lanes but i'm concerned it leaves such a large footprint without being able to add greenery/trees or to extend white oak bayou park. thank you.

From: ronnie.self@sbcglobal.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-24-2013 01:28 PM

Ronnie Self
3308 Saint Emanuel Street
Houston, TX, 77004
ronnie.self@sbcglobal.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Re: Third Public Meeting Comments November 14 & 19, 2013 I attended the meeting on November 14 at the Aldine 9th Grade School. I am particularly interested in Segment 3 of the I-45 project since I live in the area. I favor the Segment 3 Alternative 11 with the parkway. In general for all of the I-45 segments I favor schemes that eliminate or strongly minimize elevated lanes. Massif freeways and elevated portions are not a trend for cities of the future judging by what has been done in other cities such as Boston, San Francisco or Dallas (the Woodall Rogers covered freeway/park) for example. The freeways should be the least intrusive as possible in the neighborhoods. They should be visually pleasing. They should minimize the rupture in neighborhoods between one side and the other of the freeway. I am also concerned by the short leg of Segment 3 sometimes called "the canyon" where Highways 59 and 288 come together and is located roughly between Alabama street to the south and I-45 to the north. Though no modifications are shown for this portion now, I suspect that at some point there will be question of making some sort of link between the soon to come HOV lanes of 288 and any of the alternative modifications to Segment 3 of the I-45 project. I am strongly opposed to any widening of "the canyon" in this area and equally opposed to elevated lanes. Any modifications in this area should take as an example the modifications that were previously made to Highway 59 from roughly Montrose Boulevard to Hazard Street. This is a more progressive solution that is less intrusive in the existing city fabric. The vertical retaining walls on each side maximize the existing right of way. The large span bridges eliminate columns in the freeway itself and allow for more lanes and more efficiency. The bridges in that portion of 59 are also attractive. Another option for the 288/59 "canyon" would be to cover it and make a park similar to the park that now covers Woodall Rogers in Dallas. The "canyon" lends itself well to such a solution since it is already below grade. This would obviously stitch together the city and re-establish a link between the Third Ward and Midtown and would be an ambitious and significant civic gesture.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 371

From: jackshao4045@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-25-2013 01:30 AM

Jack Shao
4045 North Freeway #424
Houston, TX 77022
jackshao4045@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Segment 1 I support alt 7 take ROW from both side of freeway.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 372

From: boberry@netzero.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 11-28-2013 12:43 PM

Jon Derry
115 Alma St.
Houston, TX, 77009
boberry@netzero.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I strongly prefer alternative 10 for segment 2. I think elevated lanes should be avoided if at all possible next to residential areas. I would like Txdot to consider constructing noise walls prior to road construction to help with the construction noise.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 373

From: brock@saintarnold.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-02-2013 06:54 PM

Brock Wagner
2000 Lyons Ave
Houston, TX 77020
brock@saintarnold.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I am against the elevated plan for I-10 between 59 & I-45. It will have to be extremely high to clear the railroad bridges and Elysian Viaduct. This will run right next to our building and the area we are planning on building a beer garden as part of redevelopment of the land on the north side of I-10 between 59 & I-45.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 374

From: sawgrass3@verizon.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-02-2013 07:58 PM

George Dorris
1744 Silver Bend Dr
Dickinson, Texas 77539
sawgrass3@verizon.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

This is a bad decision to expand the I 45 North Freeway. With the economy being so bad and it being difficult to make a living, the added stress on retail sales from the construction problems will probably cost me my job. I am barely making it now and being in sales, with the lack of business major road construction causes, there is no way this will help. I lost my job when Katy Freeway was torn up because my employer had to reorganize. I am over 50 years old and cannot have this happen again and expect to recover from this. Please reconsider and do not rip up the freeway. Think of the jobs it will cost and there are not that many out there.

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 375

From: Boatstorage@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 12-05-2013 12:30 PM

Dan McMillan
5901 n Frwy
Houston tx 77076
Boatstorage@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Don't widen any existing lanes use hardy toll road

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 376

From: Boatstorage@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 12-05-2013 12:31 PM

Dan McMillan
5901 n Frwy
Hou tx
Boatstorage@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

When is next meeting

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 377

From: woodwardj@fiestamart.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-05-2013 04:54 PM

James A. Woodward
5235 Katy Freeway
Houston, Texas 77007
woodwardj@fiestamart.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I am a Director of Operations for Fiesta Mart Inc. We operate 34 international supermarkets that cater to the diverse cultures of the greater Houston area. One of our larger and more popular stores is located on the northeast corner of I-45 and Airline Drive. More than 20,000 customers from over 50 countries use this store every week to purchase goods and services from their native countries. It is truly a "melting pot" of cultures. Over 200 full time employees work at this location to provide the service for our clientele. We would oppose any alternative that would limit our parking and egress. We recommend alternative four which would take the right of way from the west side of I-45. Thank you James A. Woodward

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 378

From: tunderwood@billingsleyco.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-05-2013 05:52 PM

Tracy Underwood
2 Mustang Point Court
The Woodlands, TX 77382
tunderwood@billingsleyco.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = True

We have two buildings at North Freeway Business Park owned by BCO North Freeway, Ltd, owners are Lucy and Henry Billingsley. This is home to 13 tenants. www.billingsleyco.com We absolutely request that other options be taken to avoid condemning this property. I am the Asset Manager. My company benefits from the rental income.

Comment from NHHIP website

W379

From: work77009@aol.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-06-2013 02:11 AM

Peter Cho
4045 North Freeway
Houston, TX 77022
work77009@aol.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

For segment 1 I choose alt 7, take ROW from both east and west side of fwy. Not fair to take ROW from on single side. I also must request again that you do so by taking as little to no ROW as possible. Do not kill properties.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 380

From: chrislaakso@hotmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-06-2013 02:55 PM

Chris Laakso
1745 Hawthorne
Houston, TX 77098
chrislaakso@hotmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I think these plans are contrary to what we need to do to facilitate traffic flow. Additionally, the thought of building up to a 14 lane elevated freeway through the center of Houston gives me reasons for pause. Three of my concerns include: • The reduction of an option to travel around/through downtown. We're not Detroit; Houston is growing and we need to maintain existing options, at a minimum. • Traffic issues could be compounded with no ability to re-route. • The creation of a physical and mental barrier (over 300 feet wide) separating downtown and the EaDo (east side), which will hamper the economic development happening in the area.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 381

From: Boatstorage@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-06-2013 04:15 PM

Dan McMillan
5901 n frwy
Hou tx 77076
Boatstorage@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

When is the next meeting

Comment from NHHIP website

W 382

From: tbacon@lionstonegroup.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-10-2013 07:18 PM

Tom Bacon
100 Waugh Dr, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77007
tbacon@lionstonegroup.com
Employed = False
Business = True
Benefit = False

Texas Department of Transportation Houston District P.O. Box 1386 Houston, Texas 77251-1386 Re: North Houston Highway Improvement Project Dear Madam/Sir: I write to ask for certain modifications to the Texas Department of Transportation's (TXDOT) proposed North Houston Highway Improvement Project to ensure connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians in light of the project known as Bayou Greenways 2020. I am the chair of the Houston Parks Board, a non-profit dedicated to creating, improving, protecting and advocating for parkland in the Greater Houston Region and also an avid cyclist. The Houston Parks Board's and the City of Houston's Bayou Greenways 2020 project creates a network of shared use trails along 9 of the major bayous within the City in order to create a 150-mile integrated transportation network for pedestrian and bicycle-based transportation. This system will also create a network of parks along these shared use trails that have significant environmental, economic, and public health benefits for our City. These trails will be built to federal standards and will tie into similar trails built in recent years by TXDOT and the City of Houston. The total public and private investment for this new network will be \$215,000,000. The citizens of Houston have overwhelmingly supported using \$100,000,000 of park bonds for the project, and separately, the Houston Parks Board has raised over \$70,000,000 of matching funds thus far. The Houston Parks Board will complete the network in 2020. The Bayou Greenways 2020 project however does not include Little White Oak Bayou, which parallels and crosses Interstate 45 North and its interchange with Loop 610 North numerous times. As a result, a significant area of north Houston may not have access to shared use trails or the connected parkland along White Oak Bayou unless TXDOT incorporates some elements to ensure pedestrian and bicycle connections in the proposed North Houston Highway Improvement

Project. With this project, there is a unique and important opportunity to ensure that residents have manageable connections to the Bayou Greenways 2020 project. Thus, I specifically request that TXDOT incorporate the following into its plans: 1. A continuous shared use trail along Little White Oak Bayou from its confluence with White Oak Bayou immediately south of Quitman Street to the north-most point where the modified I-45 right-of-way is adjacent to Little White Oak Bayou. 2. A shared use trail connector across I-45 North between Woodland Park and Moody Park to ensure access to these important parks. 3. A shared use trail connector across I-45 between Patton and Jewett Streets to ensure connectivity. 4. A shared use trail connector through the I-45/I-610 interchange, since I believe these interchanges often present the biggest problems for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Thank you for your consideration of this important proposed transportation facility within Houston's growing pedestrian and bicycle transportation network. Sincerely, Tom Bacon

Comment from NHHIP website

W 383

From: cfhong66@hotmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-12-2013 02:44 AM

C F Hong
4025 north freeway
Houston, TX, 77022
cfhong66@hotmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

segment 1 I want alt 7. take ROW from both side of freeway. thank you.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 384

From: Boatstrage@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-12-2013 12:28 PM

McMillan
N fwy
Hou tx 77076
Boatstrage@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

When is the next meeting

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 385

From: sales@shamrockmachinery.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-17-2013 06:02 PM

Mike Richards
3200 North Freeway
Houston, TX 77009
sales@shamrockmachinery.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Shamrock Machinery Company buys and sells large machines that require 18 wheel trucks for loading/unloading. If you disrupt access to our building then we will immediately be out of business and we will have to let all of our employees go. How much notice do you intend to give us?

Comment from NHHIP websiteW 386

From: tmerrick@pagethink.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-19-2013 05:25 PM

Tami Merrick
1515 Houston Avenue
Houston Texas 77007
tmerrick@pagethink.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I will be submitting formal responses on the alternates selected in a separate email. I would like to comment that the public opinion process is not working regarding expansion into Houston from the Beltway into Downtown. In round 2 clearly the Hardy route was embraced by the majority of the people responding to the expansion. Tx Dot has explained that it was abandoned due to the issues at the termination point. In recent meetings, it is clear that they did not fully explore alternatives of termination including tunnel. They could have looked at exiting traffic prior to downtown that had a downtown destination to filter in on artery streets. It also appears that Tx Dot has done little exploration into the notion of routing managed lane traffic that doesn't have a downtown destination around in lieu of into downtown. This would greatly assist in traffic, congestion and pollution in the downtown area. Other case studies have proven that people will take alternative routes to avoid heavy traffic. By pass routes are common in most major cities. The expansion project should also be following sustainable highway standards and utilize a more comprehensive approach to highway design in the fourth largest city in the United States "Houston". From the Federal Highway Administration: What is sustainability? Sustainability is often described using the "triple bottom line" concept, which includes giving consideration to three primary principles: Social, Environmental, and Economic. The goal of sustainability is the satisfaction of basic social and economic needs, both present and future, and the responsible use of natural resources, all while maintaining or improving the well-being of the environment on which life depends. What is a sustainable highway? In the

transportation industry, projects and systems serve many different and sometimes competing objectives, including safety, mobility, environmental protection, livability, and asset management. A sustainable approach seeks to meet all of these needs while hitting economic targets for cost-effectiveness throughout a highway's life cycle. For the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), a sustainable approach to highways means helping decision makers make balanced choices among environmental, economic, and social values—the triple bottom line of sustainability—that will benefit current and future road users. A sustainable approach looks at access (not just mobility), movement of people and goods (not just vehicles), and provision of transportation choices, such as safe and comfortable routes for walking, bicycling, and transit. Sustainability encapsulates a diversity of concepts as well, including efficient use of funding, incentives for construction quality, regional air quality, climate change considerations, livability, and environmental management systems. Tx Dot and the state of Texas needs to move into present time in how we design major transportation networks for our larger cities.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 387

From: Elicio.bolivar@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-20-2013 09:42 PM

Hector bolivar
2621 north main
Houston tx 77009
Elicio.bolivar@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I noticed that all the highway lights were built on the east side of the highway. Won't it be more cost effective to widen the west part of i45? Those are a lot of light fixtures that will have to torn down and then erected again, enormous waste of resources.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 388

From: tmerrick@pspaec.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-21-2013 08:46 AM

tami merrick
1515 Houston Avenue
Houston, Texas
tmerrick@pspaec.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I would like to see this project enhance the city of Houston and I am in favor of the Pierce Parkway concept. I may note there was not enough information presented to the public to clearly understand how it would work. Below is the case study in San Francisco and vision SN22 and First Ward would have for such a project along with a request that no additional Right away occurs in our

neighborhoods. San Francisco's Embarcadero (parallel to Pierce Elevated) San Francisco's Embarcadero Freeway was originally designed to connect the Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge but was never completed. The Embarcadero only succeeded in cutting off the city from the waterfront and running long ramps deep into the neighborhood fabric. In the most used sections, traffic on the Embarcadero reached well past 100,000 vehicles per day. Freeway Removal The battle to demolish the Embarcadero had been struggling until the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. After the earthquake damaged it beyond repair, the city experienced initial traffic congestion but it did not lead to permanent traffic disruptions. The network of streets was able to absorb a large amount of traffic given their previous underused capacity. In addition, annual BART ridership experienced a 15% increase. The scales of public opinion shifted towards removal when residents saw the redevelopment potential and the cost comparisons. Evolving cost projections, which climbed from \$15 million for strengthening to \$69.5 million for freeway reconstruction, changed the debate in favor of a boulevard--with a final cost less than \$50 million. The Boulevard Built in 2002, the Boulevard itself was deemed an impressive success from many different angles. Designed by ROMA Design Group as a dynamic multi-use boulevard, it contains two banks of thoroughfare traffic, 3 lanes going in each direction and a streetcar line running down the center. This allows for the accommodation of significant auto traffic, but also gives residents options other than private vehicles. Economic Development The area has sprung to life since the freeway demolition. More than 100 acres of land along the waterfront that had once been dominated by the elevated freeway gave way to a new public plaza and waterfront promenade. Dense commercial development has lined the street, housing in the area increased by 51% and jobs have increased by 23%. High profile redevelopments like the old Ferry Building and Pier 1 have continued to transform the waterfront. Similarly, the old industrial South Market area was redeveloped as a dense, mixed-use neighborhood. As of 2006, the large number of recent assessments in the redesigned area pushed the average sale base year to 2000 compared to the citywide average of 1996. This is the type of win Houston needs from I 45 expansion!

Comment from NHHIP website

W 389

From: jon_roque@live.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-24-2013 11:38 AM

Jonathan Roque
3912 Bute St Apt. 1
Houston, TX 77006
jon_roque@live.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Segment 1 I think most land owners would like Alternative 7 the most. It would also probably be cheaper to use the existing ROW needed to build the additional lanes. The expansion of this section is very much needed. Segment 2 I like Alternatives 10 and 11. Segment 3 If I had to choose an option, I would go with 10. Honestly not too fond of any of the options, but it's hard to comment with the limited amount of data. I would be more concerned about the fluidity of traffic flow and the ease of access to and from downtown. Since none of that is shown it's hard to judge which one is the best option. Analyzing the data that is available, I would have to go with what I feel would be the most effective approach to improving traffic flow (for everyday traffic and evacuations). I would recommend the addition of one lane for the I45 Southbound freeway starting at or near Crawford. I think having the additional lane for exiting traffic headed toward 59 Southbound would help alleviate bottlenecks caused by drivers trying to merge from I45 to the 59 exit ramps. This area would consist of two lanes for 59 Southbound exits, three lanes for I45 Southbound, and one lane for 59 Northbound. Oh and two big flashing signs that tell people to get in the lane they want to travel with a friendly note saying don't wait until the last minute to pick the direction you want to travel. I'm sure that wouldn't help much, but maybe. I like the plans on the I10 Express addition. I don't care for the other Alternatives. Putting I45 next to 59 seems like it would be a bit much and the traffic would have to be very careful turning at the I10, 59 intersection. This seems as if it would be a very tight turn considering that it is not an exit ramp. Also, not sure how beneficial a parkway would be between Downtown and Midtown. There are so many intersections in this area so I don't see the benefit. Pierce isn't an extremely congested street anyway with little to no traffic congestion. It's hard to comment on the Parkway alternative since there is little information. I know the majority of traffic from downtown in that area would use it to access I45 Northbound and the I10 Freeway. I would like to make a suggestion on keeping traffic divided in this area. It seems as though many motorists cause traffic congestion by trying to merge from I45 Northbound to get to the I10 exit ramps. Also, those entering from St Joseph St and Pease tend to cause congestion when trying to merge onto I45 Northbound and they especially create congestion when trying to merge onto I10 Westbound. It might be a good idea to have a direct connector to I45 Northbound as well as I10 going

East and Westbound for those entering from the St Joseph, Pease, Allen Parkway, and Walker entrances. I know this would create quite a few ramps especially taking into consideration that these entrances also connect to Memorial and Houston Ave, but I believe it would alleviate congestion from traffic merging left and right. You guys are the experts so I leave that thought with you. I would hope that the area between 288 and I45 for 59North and South would also be optimized. I believe it would be a great idea to increase the number of lanes for 59 Northbound and Southbound from the current minimum of 2 lanes to at least 3 lanes. This would hopefully alleviate bottlenecking issues where 59 meets 288. As always thanks for reading and have a Merry Christmas/Happy holidays.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 390

From: carl@bpirealty.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-25-2013 08:53 AM

Carl Swierc (BPI Realty Services Inc
3800 Southwest Freeway, Suite 304
Houston Texas 77018
carl@bpirealty.com
Employed = True
Business = False
Benefit = False

We manage the shopping center at 6500 Northwest Freeway which is on the east or north side of I45. We would appreciate being keep abreast of the decision process as to which side of the freeway will be used. At this time we feel the public would be better served if the expansion was on the west or south of IH45 given the number and type of businesses on both sides of the freeway

Comment from NHHIP website

W 391

From: Ivyyang@rocketmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-28-2013 06:47 PM

Ivy
4114 North Fwy
Houston TX 77022
Ivyyang@rocketmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = True

I have sat less than 20ft away from I45 for the past 5 years. Over this period, I have watched my side of freeway area improving due to the endeavors of entrepreneurs who have contributed finance and hard work to create businesses that provide employment within the local community and consequently generate tax revenues. Following receiving a Highway Expansion Project notification I attended a public meeting held on November 19th, where it was stated that I45 required widening to accommodate

the increase in traffic that has occurred over the past few years on this highway. This increase in traffic density is projected to increase further over the coming years, according to the report from one university commissioned to conduct a study on the need for expanding I45. I am surprised by this conclusion, the downtown area is a contained area, with its current workforce, without the possibility of further expansion of its business area; therefore there isn't the area to support a substantial increase in the number of people beyond those who currently commute into the downtown area. I have seen the traffic is improving since the last five years besides when there is an accident and or peak hour which are same in all area. Some statistics show people are traveling less, not only because the economy, but also in this era of digital technology, a lot of work can be done remotely. This is not to say that I don't agree that improvement and some expansion might be needed, but not to the extent that the report predicts, and not to the level that would necessitate widening the highway by the suggested 200-225 ft. on one side. I am on the east side of freeway close to 610 loop North, and have worked very hard to improve the property. I have protected it like it is my home for the last 5 years, there isn't even any graffiti on my property. So I strongly oppose expansion of I45 on east side of the freeway, not only because I agree with all of the reasons others have posted online, but also because removal of businesses that are parallel to the freeway in the section between 610 Loop north to North Shepherd, will leave only a large numbers of small old houses, with no space to re-establish it into a business community. Not only will the housing area be unpleasant to live in due to being located in a narrow strip between the expanded highway and the light railway, but the image presented, located just north of the downtown area, will not give a favorable impression to those entering the center of Houston. Yours Sincerely

Comment from NHHIP website

W 392

From: sales@shamrockmachinery.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-30-2013 09:48 AM

Mike Richards
3200 North Freeway
Houston, TX 77009
sales@shamrockmachinery.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Shamrock Machinery Company has had a 30,000 square foot warehouse located at 3200 North Freeway, Houston, TX 77009 since 1981. We typically employ eight to ten people and we contribute around \$70,000.00 per year in property and inventory taxes. Several of your proposed right-of-way sections imply that (1) we will not have frontage road access for an extended period of time, and (2) our building may be destroyed due to highway expansion. Shamrock Machinery Company will be forced out of business in either case. Several of our employees live in the 77009 zip code. They will be forced to find other jobs, probably outside this zip code. Our probable new location would be in the newer industrial area northwest of Houston. If we move and re-open in the northwest, we will take our tax contribution with us. And our future employees will be chosen from our new local area, not 77009 and probably not Houston. Please keep this in mind and do not select Segment 1, Alternative 5. This would logically lead to acquiring east side right-of-way in Segment 2, which would have a negative impact on Shamrock Machinery Company and force us to close our current location.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 393

From: aaronlytle@mac.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-31-2013 08:56 AM

Aaron Lytle
1517 Ovid St
Houston, TX 77007
aaronlytle@mac.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I like alt 10. It looks like the closest we can get to a tunnel.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 394

From: james.larimore@comcast.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 12-31-2013 09:48 AM

James Larimore
2934 Smokey Forest Lane
Spring TX 77386
james.larimore@comcast.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Why are not rough costs provided with the alternatives?

Comment from NHHIP website

W 395

From: james.larimore@comcast.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-01-2014 10:58 AM

James Larimore
2934 Smokey Forest Lane
Spring, TX 77386
james.larimore@comcast.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Re: I-45 Future Construction Please look into using (killing) the HOV lane by creating a new "Bus Only/Expensive HOT Lane" ROAD. Create a new road alongside the current Hardy. There is a lot more room over there than the 45 area; costs would be A LOT less! By using the HOV space, 45 could be a proper road with a breakdown area in the middle. Fix the low bridges and be done with it. DO NOT GO CRAZY WITH THE MONEY. Keep it simple, please.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 396

From: gataca42@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-02-2014 01:46 PM

Steven Halvorson
1013 W. Ellaine
Pasadena
gataca42@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

The expansion of the I corridor is mostly inevitable. Once completed would be a welcome improvement to our area. I would however like to say that we get the project completed on a reasonable time line. Don't make this a perpetual project that takes years to complete. I have often seen zones that take up public highways in perpetual cycles of stalled work progress. Meanwhile drivers would need to use toll roads making wonderful revenues for the county while the progress stalls. One day in the not so distant future it will become difficult to keep buying up land and expanding roads without offering better transport opportunities such as light rail and future train transport. Houston has missed many opportunities to be a model city with respect to transport and logistics. So as I always welcome expanding roads. We need to take play books from our other countries that have successfully implemented alternatives to automobile usage in the metropolitan areas. Dallas actually has a more developed rail system than Houston.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 397

From: pkello@gwa.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-03-2014 01:53 PM

Paul Kellogg
3322 Beauchamp
Houston, TX 77009
pkellogg@hwa.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Segment 2 - I would choose Alt. 10 (Depressed). I-45 is THE gateway into one of the most beautiful views of Downtown. It could be dramatic and architecturally interesting. The bridges could be like those over SH 59 in the Museum District. The "support frames" over the main lanes could be painted different colors, or planted with draping vines (like the airport road in Honolulu). This is a great opportunity to give character to a public space in Houston (at not much cost) and give Houston a real gateway. Segment 3 - whatever you do, increase the number of lanes from 288/59 to I-45 North!!! Horrible bottleneck. And separate southbound 288 from southbound 59. That's a nasty jumble. Eliminate the "rollercoaster effect" on I-45 South going to the Pierce Elevated. The mere layout causes people to slow down and bottleneck starting at the Dallas St exit. Eliminate the last on-ramp (on both sides) before the Pierce Elevated begins and make a smooth (rising elevation) transition for the southbound and northbound lanes. If that is part of Alt. 11, I'd support the parkway concept. Otherwise, you're just rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Thanks for considering my views.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 398

From: seanmurphy76@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-03-2014 02:16 PM

Sean Murphy
2002 Blodgett St.
Houston TX 77004
seanmurphy76@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Why is the public request of sinking the highway being ignored? This option was awesome! Any and all options need to include provisions for commuter rail down the center of the highway (like Chicago and NYC examples) and metro rail interaction with stations at overpasses. Please give us alternatives to the automobile, this is such short sighted planning by ya'll. We're gonna' be paving over downtown next at this rate. Please show some creativity!

Comment from NHHIP website

W 399

From: Ivyyang@rocketmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-03-2014 02:43 PM

Ivy Yang

4114 North Freeway
Houston, TX 77022
Ivyyang@rocketmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Texas Department of Transport Dear Sir, I have sat less than 20ft away from I45 for the past 5 years. Over this period, I have watched my side of freeway area improving due to the endeavors of entrepreneurs who have contributed finance and hard work to create businesses that provide employment within the local community and consequently generate tax revenues. Following receiving a Highway Expansion Project notification I attended a public meeting held on November 19th, where it was stated that I45 required widening to accommodate the increase in traffic that has occurred over the past few years on this highway. This increase in traffic density is projected to increase further over the coming years, according to the report from one university commissioned to conduct a study on the need for expanding I45. I am surprised by this conclusion, the downtown area is a contained area, with its current workforce, without the possibility of further expansion of its business area; therefore there isn't the area to support a substantial increase in the number of people beyond those who currently commute into the downtown area. Some statistics show people are traveling less, not only because the economy, but also in this era of digital technology, a lot of work can be done remotely. This is not to say that I don't agree that improvement and some expansion might be needed, but not to the extent that the report predicts, and not to the level that would necessitate widening the highway by the suggested 200-225 ft. on one side. I am on the east side of freeway close to 610 loop North, and have worked very hard to improve the property. I have protected it like it is my home for the last 5 years, there isn't even any graffiti on my property. So I strongly oppose expansion of I45 on east side of the freeway, not only because I agree with all of the reasons others have posted online, but also because removal of businesses that are parallel to the freeway in the section between 610 Loop north to North Shepherd, will leave only a large numbers of small old houses, with no space to re-establish it into a business community. Not only will the housing area be unpleasant to live in due to being located in a narrow strip between the expanded highway and the light railway, but the image presented by housing of this type, located just north of the downtown area, will not give a favorable impression to those entering the center of Houston. Yours Sincerely Ivy Yang Email: Ivyyang@rocketmail.com 4114 North Freeway. Houston TX 77022

Comment from NHHIP website

W 400

From: dschenke@greatereastend.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-03-2014 05:19 PM

Diane Schenke
3211 Harrisburg Blvd
Houston, TX 77003
dschenke@greatereastend.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

The Greater East End Management District would like to be added as a participating agency to this process.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 401

From: cruth@publicstorage.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-03-2014 08:36 PM

Public Storage, byCarolynn Ruth
701 Western Avenue
Glendale, CA 91201
cruth@publicstorage.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Public Storage owns the properties located at 9030 North Freeway and 9811 North Freeway, both in Houston. Public Storage would oppose any project that would require the acquisition of land from either property. However, if the project goes forward and additional right-of-way must be acquired, Public Storage would prefer that all additional right-of-way be taken from the east side of I-45, and that no additional right-of-way be acquired from the west side of I-45. Accordingly, of the three alternatives presented at the 3rd Public Meeting, Public Storage would prefer Alternative 5, which acquires all additional right-of-way from the east side of I-45. Carolynn Ruth Real Estate Paralegal Public Storage 701 Western Avenue Glendale, CA 91201-2349 Tel: 818.244.8080 x1410 Fax: 818.548.9288 Email: cruth@publicstorage.com

Comment from NHHIP website

W 402

From: olgac.oc@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-09-2014 07:28 PM

Olga Carachure
448A W. Little York
Houston, TX 77076
olgac.oc@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Good evening, I am writing to you in regards to the new project on saving the "East Side of I-45" . My question would be if I am able to help by possibly getting more signatures to save this side ? If so, email me the form. Furthermore, I am currently employed on that side of I-45, If I can possibly get the form to get signatures from my customer's that walk-in to our business I will be more than glad to do so. For the simple reason that I enjoy my job and If I can do anything to help all of us keep our job and save our neighborhood count me in. Please email me to address below. Thank you, Have a great day! Olga Carachure

Comment from NHHIP website

W 403

From: jlarimore@daissa.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-10-2014 09:46 AM

James Larimore
2934 Smokey Forest Lane
Spring, TX 77386
jlarimore@daissa.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

For Segment 1, here are my thoughts; In my naive opinion it could only be Alternative 7. The other's require too much space. Alternative 7 is very very expensive and possibly my idea would be better. Please look into using (killing) the I-45 HOV lane BY creating a new "Bus Only/HOT Lane" ROAD! A new, two or four lane road, alongside the current Hardy Toll Road. There is a lot more room alongside Hardy than there is alongside 45; costs would be A LOT LOT LOT less! By using the HOV space, I-45 could be a proper road with a breakdown area in the middle. Fix the low bridges and be done with it; no MAJOR re-do.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 404

From: jlarimore@daissa.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-12-2014 09:18 AM

James Larimore
2934 Smokey Forest Lane
Spring, TX 77386
jlarimore@daissa.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Did any North-Hardy Planning Studies ever evaluate expanding in some way the Hardy Toll road? I have read all of the 2005 study and it did not.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 405

From: gnstrater@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-17-2014 06:18 PM

Gerry N. Strater
20 Buttonbush Court
The Woodlands
gnstrater@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Hardy Toll Road needs to add lanes from Woodlands to 610 - there are areas this could easily be done - just restriping. Also, most important is the extension of Hardy from Woodlands to (a) 242 then (b) S Loop 336 East at Conroe. With new developments along this corridor (Exxon/Mobil- Rayford area - Woodforest-Camp Strake - new multi-faceted "Astroworld" like development off 59 and many more) will only add extension congestion along I-45. Hardy must be extended with flyover entries/exists at these major intersections. Metro buses are not a good option - rail may never happen through these areas. Hardy is the only solution.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 406

From: robblain@hotmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-22-2014 03:08 PM

Robert Blain
5303 Verdant Way
Houston, TX 77069
robblain@hotmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Keep moving the light rail out and you'll take cars off the roads, even if they're carpool vehicles- it opens up the HOV for more people who want to ride solo and pay for that privilege. Also, the biggest thing that can be done to help alleviate congestion on I-45 and Hwy 59 is to finish the Hardy into town- that needs to happen sooner rather than later (in other words, BEFORE 2020).

Comment from NHHIP website

W 407

From: markslusher@rocketmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-23-2014 09:25 AM

Mark Slusher
5303 Nodaway Lane
Spring, Texas 77379
markslusher@rocketmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

North Highway I-45 Improvement Corridor Suggestions: 1. Flatten the roadway grade. Texans like to see where their driving and the rises/overpasses to clear secondary roads slow the traffic down. 2. Split North and South bound lanes into upper and lower deck roadways. 3. Design in an Express Rail corridor to allow 2 North and 2 South bound trains to run simultaneously. This will permit the creation of Express Train and "Milk Run" routes originating from multiple suburb points. Station access can be located under the roadway with elevator and stair service to the different platforms. If Express Rail service is reliable and scheduled at 10 minute intervals you could cut the roadway traffic to downtown. Rail speed needs to exceed 65 mph, the faster the better.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 408

From: johndhagerman@hotmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-23-2014 08:27 PM

john hagerman
24800 IH-45, #100
spring, texas 77386
johndhagerman@hotmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I own the 3.79 acre tract located at 4001 North Freeway near the Loop 610 Houston Texas and was owned by the old Coach Bus Co. on the west side of I-45. Under one highway widening plan, the west side land owners suffer the biggest taking and little taking is done to the east side owners plus this plan would take a piece of all the hotels and buildings on the west side from Loop 610 to Crosstimbers which would be more expensive to texdot to pay for all the buildings. I would suggest the taking be evenly divided between the east and west sides.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 409

From: tmerrick@pagethink.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-25-2014 10:07 PM

Tami Merrick
1515 Houston Avenue
Houston, Texas
tmerrick@pagethink.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I am opposed to the expansion in general, in that TX Dot stated it will only move cars 3 miles per hour faster. (by the time this is built that is doubtful). It doesn't address the issue of moving people quickly in and out of downtown during rush hour. It is being forced on Houstonians. If the Houston Galveston Area Council was really concerned about mobility of Houston they would be focused on moving people not just cars. We wouldn't be building managed lanes with tolls, we would be constructing BRT or commuter rail. What does this expansion do for the Houston Urban center. It will add to our traffic congestion in downtown, interrupt inner city mobility, add to downtown pollution, detract revenue in our tax base, add noise pollution, visual pollution, disturb the new buffalo bayou park expansion, take about 120 properties and charge tolls to drive on the new lanes. Yes and best of all it out tax dollars hard at work? Tx Dot should not be allowed to use eminent domain in a negligent manor. At a meeting with Jessica Farrar office at the Near North Side Tx Dot stated that if it needed to take one parking space from a land owner they would just take all their land. It made no difference to them the process was the same. In a dense urban center like Houston the taxable properties are important economic factor to the functioning of the city. It is ludicrous that a state agency can come in take private property without just cause. If all they need is a row of parking that is all they should be allowed to take. They should not be doing it for an outdated revenue generating expansion project. As one profound resident at a Near North side meeting stated. Oh let call it what it really is "Luxury Lanes for the wealthy" Texas needs mobility that addresses sustainability and livability of city centers!

Comment from NHHIP website

W 410

From: krys10k@hotmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-27-2014 10:28 AM

Kristen Mueller
4618 Michaux Street
Houston, TX 77009
krys10k@hotmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

At Public Meeting #2, you presented Alternatives to choose from that included many options the public wanted. Then at Public Meeting #3, TxDOT eliminated a number of preferred choices and substantially changed others. SEGMENT 1 I think the 4

managed lanes would work best on Hardy Toll Road, an already managed highway. On Segment 1, I want Alt 3 & 3C with Segment 2, Alt 15. This would reduce land acquisition and reduce costs and have the least economic effect. In fact, according to TxDOT, only 45 parcels would be impacted on Hardy vs 267 parcels with Alt 4 or 310 parcels with Alt 5. Hardy would also have the least effect on mobility during construction. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of alternating between Alt 4 and Alt 5 – taking property from whatever side has vacant property. I want the least economic effect on businesses & residences. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 2 I think Alt 15 – putting the managed lanes on Hardy - is the best answer to help mobility and have the least negative effect on businesses and residences. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 10 – putting frontage roads over mainlanes and providing the supporting structure to cover the mainlanes and managed lanes to create greenspace. I want TxDOT to include putting green space over the below grade areas. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 3 I think bored tunnels in a highly developed area, like downtown, are the right answer for this project. Four tunnels were offered before and four tunnels were removed by TxDOT. There was not adequate explanation of Alts 10, 11 or 12. I could not make informed decisions due to the lack of information available. The Alts do NOT address downtown bypass traffic separation from downtown traffic and do NOT provide sufficient cross section designs to determine how freeway exchanges would be designed. I oppose any additional ROW acquisition downtown, especially near the Convention Center and Ballpark. I am in favor of tunnels and depressed/below grade sections of the freeway that create grade connectivity while enhancing inner city mobility. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their current Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 11 – realign I-45 Northbound and Southbound lanes along 59, Pierce Elevated would be removed and a ground level Parkway would be created – HOWEVER, I oppose additional ROW along 59 and I need additional information on what the Pierce Parkway would look like. It appears that though TXDOT is soliciting comments from the public, they are not adequately taking public opinion into account, given the elimination of so many preferred choices in previous actions. I look forward to seeing TXDOT change this attitude, and work to improve the highways in ways most beneficial to the public and with the least negative effects on already existing businesses and homes. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 411

From: dolson@olsonllp.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-27-2014 11:49 AM

David W. Olson
1520 Spring Street
Houston, Texas 77007
dolson@olsonllp.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

To whom it may concern: It is my understanding that we have until this Friday to submit any concerns we may have about the I-45 “expansion” project. I would like to voice my opinion, as a First Ward Resident (1520 Spring Street, Houston, Texas 77007), that if possible, TxDOT should strongly consider reevaluating a possible tunnel system with green space around the downtown area (end of Segment 2 and all of Segment 3), and/or better utilization of the Hardy Toll Road to alleviate the additional traffic and burden placed on the I-45 main lanes in the downtown area. I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 412

From: PDILIP@HOTMAIL.COM
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-27-2014 03:26 PM

DILIP S PATEL
6101 AND 6103 NORTH FREEWAY
HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77076
PDILIP@HOTMAIL.COM
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I think alternative number 5 (Five) will be best from I-610 till North Shepard drive (east side of the freeway) very economical and viable as far as cost is concern and after North Shepard drive to the beltway 8 the west side of the freeway will be most viable because it will give more obtuse angle for the motorist to drive instead of having to sharp angle at the north shepard drive, which is a big problem for years. Moreover the west side of the freeway between North shepard and Beltway 8 has lots of unused land which will be greatly economical. I am strongly would want alternative 5. for this project.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 413

From: kimberly.chojnacki@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-28-2014 09:03 AM

Kimberly Chojnacki
1817B Crockett Street
Houston, Texas 77007
kimberly.chojnacki@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

The final decision on proposed roadway construction is made based on a variety of factors, many of which citizens are unaware. Given that, it is difficult to confidently indicate which "alternative" I prefer as to each of the three segments. Rather than doing so, I ask the Texas Department of Transportation to give preference to the following considerations in making the final decision: 1. Please choose the alternative with the least impact on the environment. This includes impact during the course of construction; the destruction of green space around the I-45 highway; runoff from construction and later use of the roadway; and considered distribution of traffic exhaust and pollution. 2. Please consider the alternative requiring the least amount of additional right of way. Businesses and homes in the areas around the proposed changes chose these areas for particular reasons and have invested their time and money accordingly. To disrupt expectations infringes on long- and deeply-held property rights Texas uniquely enjoy. Please consider the alternative that safeguards existing property rights and holdings, rather than requiring divesture. As a side note, this alternative likely would involve lower transaction costs as the additional right of ways would not need to be acquired, whether

through easy or more difficult means. 3. Please consider the alternative with the least day-to-day impact during the course of construction. I thank the Texas Department of Transportation for its consideration of this comment and in soliciting public opinion on the proposed alternatives. I trust the Department will use its sound judgment to come to a final decision that accounts for all needs of all affected Texans.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 414

From: bodenlm@aol.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-28-2014 11:20 AM

Laura
Bodenheimer
Houston, TX 77006
bodenlm@aol.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

There are so many areas of Houston that are being ruined by highway interchanges and construction. It is easy to see that most of the areas affected are less economically prosperous neighborhoods. These projects don't benefit the neighborhoods, only the people in cars passing through them. It looks like TxDOT is at it again – this time determined to ruin the 1st ward, the people who live there, work there, enjoy going to locally owned restaurants in the area and art galleries and studios. Please rethink the Hardy Toll Road concept. And, I hope you will rethink the use of tunnels. I hope spending my time writing to you isn't a total loss. But, have you ever noticed when an article is written in the paper about a proposed changed – it always says the neighborhoods are all for it – which we know isn't true. The only time I've seen a revolt actually printed and publicized was Ashby High Rise – and that's because the folks screaming about it had high net incomes! I know that wasn't a TxDot project, but it illustrates the point I'm making.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 415

From: sethe@netzero.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-28-2014 12:41 PM

Seth Eaton
812 W. Melwood St
Houston, TX 77009
sethe@netzero.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

PLEASE relocate the (Left-side) merge of N. Shepherd onto I-45. It is a terrible bottleneck design flaw! Also

Comment from NHHIP website

W 416

From: Boatstorage@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-28-2014 03:05 PM

Dan McMillan
5901 n Frwy
Hou tx. 77076
Boatstorage@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

When would this project start if they decided to take property

Comment from NHHIP website

W 417

From: Boatstorage@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-28-2014 03:28 PM

Dan McMillan
5901 n Frwy
Hou tx 77076
Boatstorage@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Any body going to city must use hardy if they live north of 1960 make elevated lanes on 45 take no row use hardy more , remove toll you also can have all lanes on 45 going to town in am all going out pm

Comment from NHHIP website

W 418

From: stellafiora@hotmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-28-2014 03:40 PM

janet hassinger
3526 ave s 1/2
galveston
stellafiora@hotmail.com
Employed = True
Business = False
Benefit = False

please use the existing right of way and not the Houston ave option

Comment from NHHIP website

W 419

From: rutledgepat@sbcglobal.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-28-2014 04:06 PM

Patrick W. Rutledge
607 Gladys
Houston, TX 77009
rutledgepat@sbcglobal.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I am a long time stake holder in the I-45 expansion project. I have lived in the Heights area over 30 years with the most recent 25 years as a home owner in the Woodland Heights that directly adjoins I-45. I am a founding member of the non-profit group, Friends of Woodland Park, Inc. a 501c3 organization formed to clean and revitalize this Houston park that is the second oldest in the City. This historically designated park will be severely damaged if I-45 expands into its reported ROW. Although I am concerned about the proposed expansion in all three segments of the I-45 corridor I am going to limit my comments to just segments 2 and 3. I have attended all the public meetings and studied all the alternatives. The record will reflect that I strongly supported Alternative 14 (tunnel), Alternative 15 (Hardy), and somewhat supported Alternative 10 as long as it didn't encroach/expand beyond the highway's current footprint. I am appalled but not surprised that TXDOT in its arrogance completely eliminate these alternatives even though there is clear evidence that these alternatives, especially the tunnel alternative, are largely successful. If TXDOT proceeds with its alternatives, I am in favor of the alternative that puts the frontage roads over the main lanes and providing the supporting structure to cover the main lanes and managed lanes to create green space. I want TXDOT to include putting green space over the below grade areas. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. And I do NOT support any expansion of the highway, beyond its current footprint, into the identified ROW; especially the ROW that includes any section of the historically designated Woodland Park. Regarding Segment 3: 99% of the public wanted the bored tunnels, but all alternatives including them were eliminated by TXDOT. I only support tunnels in this densely developed portion of the City. I oppose any additional ROW acquisition anywhere in this Segment

of the project. TXDOT is not listening to the public and I want that to Change! It is clear to me that TXDOT wants to do what it wants to do and the public be damned. We believe there are better alternatives and will earnestly work with our elected officials as well as TXDOT, if they choose to work with us, to arrive at those better alternatives.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 420

From: hysinger@swbell.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-28-2014 04:19 PM

Larry Hysinger
1100 Leeland
Houston, Texas 77002
hysinger@swbell.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Please leave Historic neighborhoods First Ward, Sixth Ward, and Near North side intact and Houston Avenue. Save our residential downtown communities and keep them free from freeways

Comment from NHHIP website

W 421

From: egnpdn@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-28-2014 05:35 PM

Paul Nicosia
4318 Floyd
Houston, Texas 77007
egnpdn@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

1. The "alternatives" as presented are simply variations on the same failed concept of attempting to remedy congestion with roadway expansion. True alternatives would include options that incorporate methods with potential to reduce vehicle miles traveled, actually decrease vehicular traffic volume, improve safety for all roadway users, and focus on moving people instead of accommodating their personal automobiles. 2. It appears that TxDOT has ignored sustainable highway practice and failed to include livability initiatives as supported by the Federal Highway Administration. We encourage TxDOT to look to the success of other major cities where urban centers are being revitalized through the abandonment and elimination of intrusive roadway structures. 3. As we work to accommodate increased density in urban Houston and endeavor to make urban living more appealing for the growing number of people who choose to minimize their commutes and lessen automobile dependency, it is counterproductive and environmentally unjust to add visual, noise, and air pollution sources to those core areas by constructing ever wider and higher roadway elevations, flyovers, or interchanges. 4. The public has not been presented with adequate details

to make valid and informed decisions on any of the presented variations. No connector flyovers, interchange designs, or 3D renderings to illustrate the full impact of the expansion have been presented. Section cuts included are not sufficient to represent all impacted areas. 5. The previously preferred options for Segment 3 have been eliminated, discounted, or changed, and the newly presented replacements have not been adequately vetted. To further inform affected community stakeholders and act on to their concerns, the SN22 Council urges TxDOT to hold an additional public meeting prior to moving the design process forward. 6. TxDOT needs to re-evaluate using the Hardy Toll Road and fully explain their options for segment 3, including the use of tunnels through the downtown area. 7. TxDOT needs to provide additional information regarding the options for segment 3, especially through downtown. I oppose any addition ROW acquisition in the downtown area. Additional information needs to be provided for options around the Convention Center, Ballpark and surrounding neighborhoods. I prefer the use of tunnels and depressed below grade sections that create grade connectivity while enhancing inner city mobility. 8. I believe that TxDOT needs to re-visit the options along the Hardy Toll Road for the managed lanes. Besides the need to impact far fewer parcels, the economic impact to those businesses along I-45 will be extremely high. 9. TxDOT must stop acting as a highway department mired in mid-20th Century thinking and begin functioning as an innovative agency that more equitably and wisely invests taxpayer funds in multi-modal transportation options that will better serve the needs of the future population. Expansion plans catering to facilitation of vehicular movement for suburban commuters and through traffic to the detriment of quality of place and life in the urban core are no longer acceptable. TxDOT should be focused on all types of TRANSPORTATION, not just the highway. Efforts should be made to incorporate rail (high speed, commuter and local) biking and pedestrian facilities into the plans so that a full picture of what the future holds is clear. 10. TxDOT should include, in there presentations, the economic results for each option. The public needs to be involved in making decisions based on cost.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 422

From: maryl@avenuecdc.org
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-29-2014 12:07 PM

Mary Lawler, Executive Director
Avenue Community Development Corporation, 2505 Washington Avenue
Houston, TX 77007
maryl@avenuecdc.org
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

All of the proposed alternatives show the demolition of affordable homes developed by Avenue Community Development Corporation for low-income and moderate-income homeowners on Delaney Street near the I-45 610 interchange. These homebuyers received assistance from the City of Houston and were intended to provide long-term affordable housing to benefit the homeowners and stabilize the community. If these homes are demolished, and if the remaining homes are adversely impacted, TxDOT should assist the homeowners to relocate to comparable homes in the community. Furthermore, if any of these homes remain after the construction, TxDOT should construct a sound wall to protect them from the adverse impact of the freeway expansion.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 423

From: wargarrett@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-29-2014 01:59 PM

Garrett
1001 Yale
Houston, TX, 77008
wargarrett@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

DO NOT EXTEND OR INCREASE HIGHWAYS IN AND AROUND HOUSTON. Instead focus your attention and OUR money on more sustainable means of transportation like regional rail. With more roads built today they will need to be repaired every few years. Instead build rail that will coexist with roads, thus extending the lifespan of roads because there will be less people driving. Not a hard concept to understand. Get it together or find a new job.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 424

From: Jasmine2250@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-29-2014 03:56 PM

Jasmine Coleman
1910 Westmead Drive, #4510
Houston, Texas 77077
Jasmine2250@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

To: TxDOT At Public Meeting #2, you presented Alternatives for us to choose from that included many options the public wanted. Then at Public Meeting #3, I was very disappointed that TxDOT eliminated almost all our preferred choices and substantially changed others. SEGMENT 1 I still think that the 4 managed lanes need to be on Hardy Toll Road - on Segment 1, I want Alt 3 & 3C with Segment 2, Alternative 15. This would reduce land acquisition, reduce costs, and have the least economic effect. In fact, according to TxDOT, only 45 parcels would be impacted on Hardy vs 267 parcels with Alt 4 or 310 parcels with Alt 5. Hardy would also have the least effect on mobility during construction. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of alternating between Alt 4 and Alt 5 - taking property from whatever side has vacant property. I want the least economic effect on businesses & residences. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 2 I think that Alt 15 - putting the managed lanes on Hardy - is the best answer to help mobility and have the least negative effect on businesses and residences. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 10 - putting frontage roads over main lanes and providing the supporting structure to cover the main lanes and managed lanes to create green space. I want TxDOT to include putting green space over the below grade areas. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 3 I still think that bored tunnels, in a

highly developed area like downtown, are the right answer for this project. Four tunnels were offered before and four tunnels were removed by TxDOT! I do not think there was adequate explanation of Alts 10, 11 or 12. I could not make informed decisions due to the lack of information available. The Alts do NOT address downtown bypass traffic separation from downtown traffic and do NOT provide sufficient cross section designs to determine how freeway exchanges would be designed. I oppose any additional ROW acquisition downtown, especially near the Convention Center and Ballpark. I am in favor of tunnels and depressed/below grade sections of the freeway that create grade connectivity while enhancing inner city mobility. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their current Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 11 - realign I-45 Northbound and Southbound lanes along 59. Pierce Elevated would be removed and a ground level Parkway would be created. However, I oppose additional ROW along 59 and I need additional information on what the Pierce Parkway would look like. I want TxDOT to re-evaluate using Hardy Toll Road. I want TxDOT to fully explain their options for Segment 3 and to re-evaluate using tunnels. TxDOT is NOT listening to the public and I want that to change!

Comment from NHHIP website

W 425

From: nicola@nicolaparente.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-29-2014 04:34 PM

Nicola Parente
915 Franklin St 2B
Houston, TX 77002
nicola@nicolaparente.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I think that Alt 15 – putting the managed lanes on Hardy is the best answer to help mobility and have the least negative effect on businesses and residences. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 10 – putting frontage roads over mainlanes and providing the supporting structure to cover the mainlanes and managed lanes to create greenspace. I want TxDOT to include putting green space over the below grade areas. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 426

From: carolgardosik@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-29-2014 04:54 PM

Carol Gardosik
3819 Cochran
Houston, TX 77009
carolgardosik@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

At Public Meeting #2, you presented Alternatives for us to choose from that included many options the public wanted. Then at Public Meeting #3, I was very disappointed that TxDOT eliminated almost all our preferred choices and substantially changed others. Segment 1 (Beltway 8 to 610) The public wanted Alternative 3 & 3C. By a 3 to 1 margin, people wanted to put the 4 managed lanes on Hardy - where there are already managed lanes. Additional construction would not affect traffic on I-45 and businesses, and homes would be saved from condemnation. But TxDOT eliminated this Alternative! The Public's second choice was Alternative 7 - 4 managed lanes on elevated structure in middle of I-45. This only required 30' additional Right of Way (ROW) on both sides. TxDOT changed that 30' to up to 81' ...almost 3 times more ROW! TxDOT changed Alternatives 4 & 5 from 150' ROW up to 225', a substantial increase of 50% more ROW. Segment 2 (610 to I-10) The Public's first choice was Alternative 14 - a bored tunnel - but TxDOT eliminated this Alternative! The Public's second choice was Alternative 15 - putting managed lanes on Hardy - but TxDOT eliminated this Alternative! The Public's third choice was Alternative 10 - covering roadway to create green space in below-grade areas. Although this option is still available, the green space will not be included with this Alternative. It will have to be done later with separate funding. Segment 3 (Downtown Loop) Ninety-nine percent of the public wanted the bored tunnels! (Alts 4, 5 & 6) - but TxDOT eliminated all 3 Alternatives! Instead you added 2 new Alts (11 & 12). SEGMENT 1 I still think that the 4 managed lanes need to be on Hardy Toll Road - on Segment 1, I want Alt 3 & 3C with Segment 2, Alternative 15. This would reduce land acquisition, reduce costs, and have the least economic effect. In fact, according to TxDOT, only 45 parcels would be impacted on Hardy vs 267 parcels with Alt 4 or 310 parcels with Alt 5. Hardy would also have the least effect on mobility during construction. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of alternating between Alt 4 and Alt 5 - taking property from whatever side has vacant property. I want the least economic effect on businesses & residences. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 2 I think that Alt 15 - putting the managed lanes on Hardy - is the best answer to help mobility and have the least negative effect on businesses and residences. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 10 - putting frontage roads over main lanes and providing the supporting structure to cover the main lanes and managed lanes to create green space. I want TxDOT to include putting green space over the below grade areas. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 3 I still think that bored tunnels, in a highly developed area like downtown, are the right answer for this project. Four tunnels were offered before and four tunnels were removed by TxDOT! I do not think there was adequate explanation of Alts 10, 11 or 12. I could not make informed decisions due to the lack of information available. The Alts do NOT address downtown bypass traffic separation from downtown traffic and do NOT provide sufficient cross section designs to determine how freeway exchanges would be designed. I oppose any additional ROW acquisition downtown, especially near the Convention Center and Ballpark. I am in favor of tunnels and depressed/below grade sections of the freeway that create grade connectivity while enhancing inner city mobility. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their current Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 11 - realign I-45 Northbound and Southbound lanes along 59. Pierce Elevated would be removed and a ground level Parkway would be created. However, I oppose additional ROW along 59 and I need additional information on what the Pierce Parkway would look like. I want TxDOT to re-evaluate using Hardy Toll Road. I want TxDOT to fully explain their options for Segment 3 and to re-evaluate using tunnels. TxDOT is NOT listening to the public and I want that to change!

Comment from NHHIP website

W 427

From: advthemi@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-29-2014 05:15 PM

Themistocles (Tim) Mavritsakis
1205 Lee St.
Houston, Texas, 77009
advthemi@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

1. I oppose any additional ROW acquisition downtown, especially near the Convention Center and Ballpark. I am in favor of tunnels and depressed/below grade sections of the freeway that create grade connectivity while enhancing inner city mobility. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their current Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 11 - realign I-45 Northbound and Southbound

lanes along 59. Pierce Elevated would be removed and a ground level Parkway would be created. However, I oppose additional ROW along 59 and I need additional information on what the Pierce Parkway would look like. I want TxDOT to re-evaluate using Hardy Toll Road. I want TxDOT to fully explain their options for Segment 3 and to re-evaluate using tunnels. TxDOT is NOT listening to the public and I want that to change! 2. I do not agree with the approach the city is taking to expand these road and trains access systems. We the people, our quality of life is not being considered. Excessive noise from train crossings and existing surrounding express road systems are excessive at the present time. Emphasis on additional pollution and noise levels must be prioritized before such expansions are considered. Alternate transportation options to the downtown zone/area has not been adequately investigated. Road and personal car travel into congested downtown areas is no longer an acceptable option. Please investigate and learn from other larger city examples.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 428

From: president@ghsn.org
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-30-2014 12:03 PM

Blake R. Masters
1309 W. Patton St.
Houston, TX 77009-4514
president@ghsn.org
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

In our general meeting on December 17, 2013, the Greater Heights Super Neighborhood Council passed a motion to support Segment 2 Alternative 10, favoring it over Segment 2 Alternatives 11 and 12 as it does not utilize elevated structures while still (mostly) staying in the current right-of-way. We do not support options with lanes elevated above the current grade as we do not wish to see such an increase in noise pollution nor unsightly noise mitigation devices, such as sound walls, next to our neighborhoods. The Greater Heights Super Neighborhood Council is a coalition of community-based organizations, collaborating effectively to benefit the Greater Heights. Our member stakeholder organizations include Clark Pines Civic Association, East Sunset Heights Association, Heights West Home Owners Group, Houston Heights Association, Houston Heights Progressive Civic Club, Lower Heights Civic Club, Montie Beach Civic Club, Park Square Homeowners Association, Proctor Plaza Neighborhood Association, Rotary Club of Houston Heights, Shady Acres Civic Club, Sunset Heights Civic Club, and Woodland Heights Civic Association. Best regards, --Blake Blake R. Masters President Greater Heights Super Neighborhood Council president@ghsn.org www.ghsn.org

Comment from NHHIP website

W 429

From: mgrivera@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-30-2014 01:09 PM

Maria Garcia
Common St.
Houston, Texas 77009

mgrivera@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Dear Project Team, I grew in northside and I hope the geographic does not change due to expansion of I-45. We love our neighborhoods and would hate to see it demolish or changed. Please reconsider on what side of the freeway it will effect. NOT NORTHSIDE!

Comment from NHHIP website

W 430

From: edwardcarranco@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-30-2014 01:30 PM

eddie carranco
1133 panama st
Houston Texas 77009
edwardcarranco@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Using hardy st.is more feasible than using 45 less traveled area but knowing txdot they will do what they want anyway.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 431

From: ynfhouston@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-30-2014 10:49 PM

Yolanda N. Flores
4801 Irvington Blvd.
Houston, Texas 77009
ynfhouston@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

The poor design at Gulf Bank & 45 for traffic joining I45 north bound traffic causes traffic to slow down and congestion even though traffic volume is not heavy. If the same type of design concept as the present one is utilized for the future, more unnecessary congestion will be created.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 432

From: trevi83500@aol.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-31-2014 01:02 PM

Jose Angel Trevino
2506 Everett
Houston, Texas 77009
trevi83500@aol.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

My opinion is simple. Regardless on the kind of expansion you decide on. It's not really going to eliminate traffic unless you think like big city living. Your biggest comment is the City of Houston is growing in population and we need bigger freeways. Wrong we need smarter freeways and massive transit system bringing areas together. Your stuck in the past and selling out any new ideas for better living like the HOV. Being sold out at different hours of the day to whoever wants to buy a minute of their life back. Massive transportation is needed in big cities. If you don't agree with this than how can you say that we need wider freeways to support our growing city. If you put a wider freeway in my area you will cause more children, the elderly and the weak individuals more harm due to the pollution you will be creating. Let's get massive transportation going and those who don't want use it. It will be the individual's choice to sit in traffic. Life is about choices. They chose to live away from work and commute. So my choice neither plan works in the long run but what do you care. So let's pick one Segment 2- Alternative 10 (depressed) so that our health can have a small chance. As far as the boxes at the bottom. these boxes are for TXDOT money makers. Put one for concerned, affected or ignored citizen.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 433

From: maryhayslip@me.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-31-2014 01:13 PM

Mary Hayslip
118 Alma Steet
Houston ,Texas 77009
maryhayslip@me.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I don't like any of the options but #10 is the best of the worse so pleas let me vote for #10

Comment from NHHIP website

W 434

From: Boatstorage@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-31-2014 07:18 PM

Dan McMillan
5901 n Frwy
Hou tx 77076
Boatstorage@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Elevated on 45 widen hardy that is what is was built for

Comment from NHHIP website

W 435

From: howard@howardsherman.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date 01-31-2014 08:02 PM

howard sherman
2412 bartlett#3
houston ,tx 77098
howard@howardsherman.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

SEGMENT 1 I still think that the 4 managed lanes need to be on Hardy Toll Road – on Segment 1, I want Alt 3 & 3C with Segment 2, Alt 15. This would reduce land acquisition and reduce costs and have the least economic effect. In fact, according to TxDOT, only 45 parcels would be impacted on Hardy vs 267 parcels with Alt 4 or 310 parcels with Alt 5. Hardy would also have the least effect on mobility during construction. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of alternating between Alt 4 and Alt 5 – taking property from whatever side has vacant property. I want the least economic effect on businesses & residences. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 2 I think that Alt 15 – putting the managed lanes on Hardy is the best answer to help mobility and have the least negative effect on businesses and residences. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 10 – putting frontage roads over mainlanes and providing the supporting structure to cover the mainlanes and managed lanes to create greenspace. I want TxDOT to include putting green space over the below grade areas. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 3 I still think that bored tunnels in a highly developed area, like downtown, are the right answer for this project. Four tunnels were offered before and four tunnels were removed by TxDOT! I do not think there was adequate explanation of Alts 10, 11 or 12. I could not make informed decisions due to the lack of information available. The Alts do NOT address downtown bypass traffic separation from downtown traffic and do NOT provide sufficient cross section designs to determine how freeway exchanges would be designed. I oppose any additional ROW acquisition downtown, especially near the Convention Center, residential neighborhoods and Ballpark. I am in favor of tunnels and

depressed/below grade sections of the freeway that create grade connectivity while enhancing inner city mobility. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their current Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 11 – realign I-45 Northbound and Southbound lanes along 59, Pierce Elevated would be removed and a ground level Parkway would be created – HOWEVER, I oppose additional ROW along 59 and I need additional information on what the Pierce Parkway would look like. I want TxDOT to re-evaluate using Hardy Toll Road; I want TxDOT to fully explain their options for Segment 3 and to re-evaluate using tunnels. TxDOT is NOT listening to the public and I want that to change!

Comment from NHHIP website

W 436

From: rominj@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-31-2014 09:44 PM

Romin Jahangiri
3226 pebble trace
Houston, tx, 77068
rominj@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I am upset that tx dot has increased the right of way needed on i-45. I am opposed to any increase of right away because of the negative effects on businesses and noise/ pollution that will affect residences. I plan on opposing any significant increase in right of way on either side of the highway. If land is needed for a wider highway, I suggest it be taken on the westside of I-45 as there is more vacant land on that side of the highway. Also, there is no reason why I-45 needs to have 4 hov/hot lanes. I believe that is a bit excessive. Please look at expanding the Hardy toll road and not I-45.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 437

From: gulf4444@aol.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-31-2014 09:55 PM

Carolyn Irwin
1027 W Melwood
Houston TX 77009
gulf4444@aol.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

SEGMENT 1 I still think that the 4 managed lanes need to be on Hardy Toll Road – on Segment 1, I want Alt 3 & 3C with Segment 2, Alt 15. This would reduce land acquisition and reduce costs and have the least economic effect. In fact, according to TxDOT, only 45 parcels would be impacted on Hardy vs 267 parcels with Alt 4 or 310 parcels with Alt 5. Hardy would also have the least effect on mobility during construction. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of alternating

between Alt 4 and Alt 5 – taking property from whatever side has vacant property. I want the least economic effect on businesses & residences. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 2 I think that Alt 15 – putting the managed lanes on Hardy is the best answer to help mobility and have the least negative effect on businesses and residences. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 10 – putting frontage roads over mainlanes and providing the supporting structure to cover the mainlanes and managed lanes to create greenspace. I want TxDOT to include putting green space over the below grade areas. I do NOT support any double decked roadways due to increased noise levels and visual pollution. SEGMENT 3 I still think that bored tunnels in a highly developed area, like downtown, are the right answer for this project. Four tunnels were offered before and four tunnels were removed by TxDOT! I do not think there was adequate explanation of Alts 10, 11 or 12. I could not make informed decisions due to the lack of information available. The Alts do NOT address downtown bypass traffic separation from downtown traffic and do NOT provide sufficient cross section designs to determine how freeway exchanges would be designed. I oppose any additional ROW acquisition downtown, especially near the Convention Center and Ballpark. I am in favor of tunnels and depressed/below grade sections of the freeway that create grade connectivity while enhancing inner city mobility. However, if TxDOT proceeds with their current Alternatives, I am in favor of Alt 11 – realign I-45 Northbound and Southbound lanes along 59, Pierce Elevated would be removed and a ground level Parkway would be created – HOWEVER, I oppose additional ROW along 59 and I need additional information on what the Pierce Parkway would look like. I want TxDOT to re-evaluate using Hardy Toll Road; I want TxDOT to fully explain their options for Segment 3 and to re-evaluate using tunnels. TxDOT is NOT listening to the public and I want that to change!

Comment from NHHIP website

W 438

From: ducroz@msn.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-31-2014 09:58 PM

Diana DuCroz
915 Fairbanks St
Houston, TX 77009
ducroz@msn.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

I am a native Houstonian and 8-yr resident and homeowner in one of the neighborhoods along the I-45 corridor inside Loop 610. I have been following the various proposals TxDOT has put forth regarding the planned expansion of I-45. I have found the material presented at the Public Meetings to be very confusing, to say the least. I understand very well that I-45 is congested and will only get worse as the city's population continues to grow. Plenty of studies have shown, however, that building our way out of congestion is ultimately impossible, and that traffic will expand to meet capacity. I work downtown and use public transit and bicycling as much as possible to get where I need to go. I chose my neighborhood in order to have these options. If suburban residents are stuck in traffic an hour every day driving their SOV, that's is also a choice– first, to live in the suburbs and second, to not take advantage of the Park–n-Ride system or carpooling options. I strongly believe that the state should not waste millions of taxpayer money in a short-term and ultimately futile attempt to expand capacity for drivers. We should instead be spending that money to provide alternative options to commuters. Commuter trains, light rail, buses, jitneys, even bike lanes, are where we should be investing, not wasting money pouring more concrete and further destroying our neighborhoods as well as our air and water quality. I realize that shipping and emergency services are also negatively affected by congestion, but the better solution to that problem is to encourage single drivers off the roads by giving them other options, not by trying to make driving even easier. As for the options presented at Public Meeting, I believe that if TxDOT must proceed with any of the formerly or currently proposed Alternatives, that expansion for Segment 1 should be directed to the currently underutilized Hardy Toll Road corridor where there are already managed lanes and the expansion will have less impact. For Segment 2, expansion should again be along Hardy, although I do not support any expansion of Hardy that will result in loss of historic houses in the historically significant area along Hardy and Elysian south of Quitman Street. I am also opposed to expansion of the existing I-45 right-of-way south of Loop 610. If TxDOT proceeds with the Alternatives currently presented, I am in favor of Alternative 10 for Segment 2 – putting frontage roads over main lanes and providing the supporting structure to cover the main lanes and managed lanes to create green space. TxDOT

should also provide green space over the below grade areas. A project similar to Seattle's downtown Freeway Park should be seriously considered for the I-45 corridor near Quitman and North Main, and possibly on other sections of I-45 in or near downtown. For Segment 3, bored tunnels or depressed/below grade lanes should be the preferred option. I am opposed to any ROW expansion in Segment 3. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I hope TxDOT will listen to the residents and property owners of Houston's Northside and respect the integrity of our community by choosing the options with the least possible impact.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 439

From: keyanspeed@gmail.com
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-31-2014 10:38 PM

Kevin Jahangiri
3226 pebble trace
Houston, tx, 77068
keyanspeed@gmail.com
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Segment 1 should have a smaller row rather than such a bigger because a bigger row will have a negative impact on homeowners, business owners, and land owners. Please minimize the row needed. There would be a huge negative impact on the local economy if tx dot pursues the commercial properties along segment 1.

Comment from NHHIP website

W 440

From: Boatstorage@att.net
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-31-2014 10:45 PM

Dan McMillan
5901 n frwy
Hou tx 77076
Boatstorage@att.net
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

Use what we got all lanes go to town 6 to 10 all lanes go out bound 3 to 7 other cars use hardy to accommodate other cars elevate more lanes on 45 if needed noise is not an issue

From: jcahill@hal-pc.org
To: comments@ih45northandmore.com
Priority: Normal
Date: 01-31-2014 11:17 PM

Jane Cahill West
2114 Lubbock Street
Houston, Texas 77007
jcahill@hal-pc.org
Employed = False
Business = False
Benefit = False

To: TxDOT From: Jane Cahill West (jcahill@hal-pc.org) Date: January 31, 2014 RE: Proposals to expand I-45 through central Houston I am gravely concerned that the current proposals to expand I-45 through central Houston for the purpose of adding managed lanes will adversely impact mobility in and around downtown in ways that are sure to outweigh the benefits, if any. The best and most cost effective way to improve mobility along the I-45 corridor through central Houston would be to make sure that the only traffic entering the central city is traffic whose destination is the central city. This could and should be done by requiring all traffic entering the central city to exit into downtown and directing pass through traffic to by-pass the central city on one of the many loops surrounding the city. The alternatives now being considered are not truly alternatives at all; they are simply variations on the same failed concept of attempting to remedy congestion with roadway expansion. True alternatives would include options that incorporate methods with potential to reduce vehicle miles traveled, permanently decrease vehicular traffic volume, and improve safety for all roadway users. Requiring traffic entering the central city to exit into downtown and directing pass through traffic to a route that would by-pass the central city would provide just such an alternative. Expansion plans that cater to facilitating vehicular movement for through traffic are detrimental to the quality of place and life in the urban core. TxDOT should look to examples in other major cities where urban centers are being improved through the abandonment and narrowing of intrusive roadway structures. As we work to accommodate increased density in urban Houston and endeavor to make urban living more appealing for the growing number of people who choose to minimize their commutes and lessen automobile dependency, it is counterproductive and environmentally unjust to add visual, noise, and air pollution sources to those core areas by constructing ever wider and higher roadway elevations, flyovers, or interchanges. Since all publicly preferred options for Segment 3 have been eliminated, discounted, or changed, and the newly presented replacements have not been sufficiently vetted, there should surely be time to consider the possibility suggested herein. Alternatively, I support the comments and recommendations submitted by the Washington Avenue Coalition Memorial Park Super Neighborhood (SN 22), the I-45 Coalition, and the Citizens Transportation Coalition. Thank you for the opportunity to comment, Jane Cahill West 2114 Lubbock Street Houston, Texas 77007 jcahill@hal-pc.org