


**Appendix J – Email
Comments 133 - 144**

Commenter 113

 You replied on 3/22/2010 8:56 AM.**Loop1604EIS**

From: Leah & Martin [catty1@earthlink.net] **Sent:** Sun 3/14/2010 10:36 AM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: Loop 1604 Environmental Impact comment
Attachments:

133

I live at 1604/281 and the traffic noise is already deafening. I am concerned about the worsening of traffic noise this project will create. Elevated ramps and added traffic capacity will substantially add to the noise levels that area already too loud for neighborhoods bordered by these freeways.

Noise is a component of the environmental impact this project will have and cannot be ignored. My house was built in 1964 when 281 was a street with street lights. I had no way of knowing that super highways would merge around my property and the properties of other neighbors and neighborhoods.


Last time I expressed my concerns I was told that the noise residents will have to bear along the length of the project would not be a consideration in the design of the project and no noise barriers would be considered. Noise reduction and barriers must be a part of the study and design.

I am also concerned about the aquifer which is our drinking water.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leah Palombo
118 Tall Oak
San Antonio, TX 78232

Commenter 2

 You replied on 3/24/2010 3:35 PM.

Loop1604EIS

From: texastwister.4@juno.com [texastwister.4@juno.com] **Sent:** Wed 3/24/2010 2:04 PM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: 1604 tolled lanes or road
Attachments:

I am opposed to tolled lanes or road on 1604. We pay federal and state gas taxes each time we buy gas and that tax was intended to pay for the construction and maintenance of roads. Texas state government has mismanaged the tax by using it for other things.

134

We have paid the gas tax to build the roads once and should not have to pay for the road twice. Texas should pass a bill to barring the use of gas tax from any other purpose than construction and maintenance of state roads.

I am retired and live on a fixed retirement, I do not have money to pay to use a road, besides it has been paid for once with the gas tax. I have to travel to medical appointments, hospitals, supermarkets, Home Depot/Loves, etc and do not have extra funds to pay tolls. If The state would use the gas tax for its intended purpose there would be less problems with funding the needed construction/maintenance. The federal tax provided to Texas has to be used for road construction /maintenance, why doesn't the state tax have to be use for its intended purpose? If Texas, Bexar county does not have sufficient funds to build the highway without making it a toll road, build what can be build with available funds and leave the rest as it is at present and put the required balance on a priority list for next available funds.

Kenneth Adams
 15406 Tamaron Pass
 San Antonio, TX 78253
 210-485-4281

Home Improvement Projects

Click here to find experienced pros to help with your home improvement project.

<http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL2131/c?cp=LotX6kBmIVKOCShrr6GKQAAJz1HQQyYLhYqC-cvL4gigJ4AAYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADNAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAShAAAAAA=>

Commenter 2

Loop1604EIS

From: texastwister.4@juno.com [texastwister.4@juno.com] **Sent:** Fri 4/16/2010 2:07 PM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: mORE 1604
Attachments:

135 I AM FOR THE UPGRADE OF 1604 BUT TOTALLY AGAINST TOLL ROADS.

KEN ADAMS
15406 TAMARON PASS
SAN ANTONIO, TX 78253
210-485-4281
CELL 210-667-5599

Penny Stock Jumping 2000%
Sign up to the #1 voted penny stock newsletter for free today!
<http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131/4bc8b5ced8f9466ff7st02duc>

Commenter 114

Loop1604EIS

From: JANET L ATKINS [j.atkins2325@sbcglobal.net] **Sent:** Sat 4/17/2010 1:59 PM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: 1604
Attachments:

136

I am 63 years old, and I own a home that is situated just one block from 1604. My plan is to sell my home and move away from the 1604 area which has become over-developed and an eyesore. Had I known what would happen when I moved there in 1998, including the politics surrounding 1604 changes, I certainly would have selected a home in an area that would not be negatively affected by the forced-upon changes.

Sincerely,

Janet Atkins

Commenter 23

Loop1604EIS

From: patdos444@netzero.com [patdos444@netzero.com] **Sent:** Mon 4/19/2010 10:59 AM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: Proposed 1604 expansion: recent meetings
Attachments:

137

I firmly oppose using costly tolled lanes on 1604. I favor adding free, general purpose lanes to 1604 using pass-through financing if necessary.

Please add my comments to those of others given at the meetings. I had to work those nights!

patrick dossey
202 Basswood Dr
San Antonio, TX 78213

\$350,000 Life Insurance!
Coverage as low as \$13.04/mon! Free, no obligation quotes to help you save.
<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3241/4bcc7e34a25ae02bst05vuc>

Commenter 115

Loop1604EIS

From: Lori Tafolla [ltafolla@satx.rr.com] **Sent:** Mon 4/19/2010 9:47 AM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: NO TOLLS!!! Add general purpose lanes to 1604
Attachments:

138 add general purpose lanes

advance further study for this to become the preferred alternative

thank you

the tafolla's

Commenter 116

Loop1604EIS

From: John Ackermann [f.ackermann@att.net] **Sent:** Sun 4/25/2010 10:43 AM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement
Attachments:

139 Please forward information on the above Impact Statement and any other pertinent info on this. Thank you.

Committer 117

Loop1604EIS

From: happy_times@juno.com [happy_times@juno.com] **Sent:** Mon 4/26/2010 8:39 AM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: Full Environmental requirements - Loop 1604
Attachments:

TO: Regional Mobility Agency 25 April 2010

San Antonio Area

SUBJ: Loop 1604

FROM: Citizens

1. There needs to be a full environmental study. There is natural aquafier and land that needs to be preserved.

2. Current business should be able to remain with current ease of access for customers.

3. Since this is current roads - There should be NO Tolling or any additional costs to the Tax Payers.

4. Do not disturb the current animals and water sources - since many depend on it.

5. Due to the many airports/Air Force Bases

140

140 continued

Commenter 117

and planes in the area - nothing should be built over 28 feet high.

Penny Stock Jumping 2000%

Sign up to the #1 voted penny stock newsletter for free today!
AwesomePennyStocks.com

See Letter Comment 129.1, 129.2, 129.3


Commenter 55



You forwarded this message on 4/28/2010 3:28 PM.

Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

Loop1604EIS

From: Annalisa Peace [annalisa@aquiferalliance.org] **Sent:** Mon 4/26/2010 5:03 PM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: GEAA - 1604 comments
Attachments:  [GEAA& AGUA Loop 1604 scoping comments 4-26-10.doc\(347KB\)](#)

141

Please accept these comments on behalf of the Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance.

Annalisa Peace
Executive Director
Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance
210-320-6294
www.aquiferalliance.org

Loop1604EIS

From: Terri Hall [terri@texasturf.org]
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: Public comments
Attachments:

Sent: Mon 4/26/2010 2:44 PM

Comments on the second public scoping meeting for Loop 1604-

142.1 We have growing concern about the terms being used to describe certain alternatives that seem to purposely mislead the public and/or to obscure what the RMA is planning to do with certain alternatives (ie - tolling). Rather than use technical transportation jargon, the general public needs to have each alternative described in terms it can understand. Using the term "managed lanes" instead of toll lanes or "demand management" instead of congestion tolling, does not properly inform the public as to the potential impacts of such an alternative, nor does an alternative that lumps mass transit and alternate modes of transportation into a simple "add general purpose lanes" alternative make sense to people (which is how it was initially presented to the Community Advisory Committee). Those ought to be separated out as individual alternatives, each with a clearly defined purpose, proposed level of traffic for each mode, and individual sets of impacts.

142.2 Next, there are flawed assumptions already occurring with various alternatives. The EIS team is assuming that the same level of traffic will take the added lanes whether the lanes are tolled or not. Obviously if a motorist has to pay extra to use a lane, it diminishes the number of drivers who can access those lanes. The team admitted it had not studied (nor did it seem on the radar to study) the impacts of gas prices on the ability of people to pay tolls or the impact of gas prices on driving behavior (as well as specific times of day) and level of traffic in general.

142.3 When questioned about the need for a certain level of expansion or not based on the planned expansion of surrounding arterial roads or freeways, the EIS team simply assumed all of the MPO's proposed expansions of such roadways would happen and that its numbers justified the need despite planned expansion of surrounding roads. MPO expansions may or may not occur depending on funding and may not happen within the timeline in its current plan. These projects routinely get postponed and even eliminated. However, no actual data of proposed development patterns, migration patterns, travel patterns, travel behavior, or traffic counts (other than general population growth) from surrounding expansion was analyzed nor did the team indicate it would study such data and incorporate the whole picture into its alternatives analysis, other than in very general terms. If an arterial expansion is deemed a priority in order to minimize impacts or a more costly expansion of a major highway, the MPO or other governmental entities can work in concert to comprehensively address the needs and aid in what may emerge as the preferred alternative (when given proper consideration/analysis).

142.4 Also, the financial viability of each alternative needs to be studied and disclosed to the public as well, like toll viability studies and how each project would be paid for (specific sources of funding, not just saying "toll bonds," but specifically what kind bonding, how much of each, and if other public subsidies are needed, specifying which kinds, etc.). Knowing the costs, financial and other potential impacts, and knowing the differences between the traffic levels and travel patterns for each alternative are crucial for the public to know before it can properly give feedback or potentially eliminate or advance various alternatives.

Terri Hall
Founder
Texans Uniting for Reform and Freedom
18866 Stone Oak Pwy., Ste 103-37
San Antonio, TX 78258
(210) 275-0640
www.TexasTURF.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email and the documents accompanying it contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individuals or entities named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify us by telephone or email.

Loop1604EIS

From: Bill Molina [molinadp@earthlink.net] **Sent:** Mon 4/26/2010 4:59 PM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: 1604 COMMENTS
Attachments:

143

NEED MORE GENERAL PURPOSE LANE OPTIONS AND VIABLE INTERSECTION FIXES TO LOOP 1604 WITHOUT ANY TOLL AND/OR MANAGES LANES.

ANY ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRES FURTHER STUDY AND APPROPRIATE SOLUTIONS TO INCREASED NOISE LEVELS ESPECIALLY THOSE COMMUNITIES DIRECTLY BEING AFFECTED AND ABUTTING LOOP 1604.

Increased capacity, increased noise levels and cut through traffic problems have NOT been properly studied, fully addressed, much less any alternative solutions presented to the affected communities regarding potential social, economic impacts and mitigation measures of a proposed toll project as required by federal law.

Furthermore, the meeting materials presented at public scoping meetings and hence the website are questionable at best by the use of misleading terms such as "managed lanes" rather than providing the public with full disclosure of the actual scope of the toll project being proposed by the very same agency conducting the environmental study. Which in itself is a clear conflict of interest. The ARMA's own letter to federal agencies seeking project approval, "The project is proposed as a four to eight full access-controlled through-lane facility with parallel partial access controlled lanes..." yet somehow that information seems to be somewhat be misguided from public presentation materials. All along the ARMA has publicly claimed it can only finance these projects as toll roads as outlined and specified in the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan. Yet nothing contained in the MPO plan conforms and identifies any preferred alternative options for Loop 1604 other than toll projects.

THEREFORE THE PUBLIC REQUIRES MORE NON-TOLL GENERAL PURPOSE LANE OPTIONS

Bill Molina
P.O. Box 1544
Helotes, Texas 78023

Commenter 119

Loop1604EIS

From: CM [alamomall@juno.com] **Sent:** Mon 4/26/2010 9:01 AM
To: Loop1604EIS
Cc:
Subject: Protect the Environment Loop 1605
Attachments:

TO: Regional Mobility Agency 25 April 2010

San Antonio Area

SUBJ: Loop 1604

FROM: Celeste Morris

9014 Arabian King, Converse, TX 78109

1. There needs to be a full environmental

144.1 study. There is natural aquifer and land that needs to be preserved. The percolation of the soil and keeping the natural water sources protected needs to be done. This is one of the

areas in which the Edwards Aquifer recharges

and needs to be protected. There really should be no excess asphalt or cars around it.

2. Current business should be able to

144.2 remain with current ease of access for customers. Many have spent millions to start and develop their businesses including concrete plants, small repair and service industries, construction companies

144.2
continued

Commenter 119

as well

as many gas and retail stores. The public should be able to get to these businesses without any further travel, distance or trouble.

Otherwise, these businesses may close.

It is bad enough that the traffic will be disrupted during road construction - but to make many customers permanently travel longer and at times make turn around - just to get to these same businesses - deters many customers. They go elsewhere - so the businesses loses income and some close.

3. Since this is current roads - There should

144.3

be NO Tolling or any additional costs to the

Tax Payers. There are adequate funds in the Texas Department of Transportation to pay LOCAL Competitive BID firms to pay for regular FREE Lane expansion. This needs to be a FAIR and open PUBLIC BID from more than 3 Austin, Texas road firms. Expanding a few lanes on Loop 1604 doesn't REQUIRE A CUSTOM BUILD - EVER!!!!

4. Do not disturb the current animals and

144.4

water sources - since many depend on it.

The current home owners - should not be disturbed at all.

Commenter 119

There should be no erosion on their land rights nor highway lanes backing up into their areas.

144.4
continued

Any land acquired by public law must have a FAIR Third Party Appraise the Fair Market Price which should be paid to any land acquired.

5. Due to the many airports/Air Force Bases

144.5

and planes in the area - nothing should be

built over 28 feet high. The air quality must remain at low levels in the best interest of all.

Sincerely,

C Morris

This e-mail is covered under Federal Privacy Laws and confidential. Any dissemination, copying, blogging, posting on the Internet, forwarding or use of this electronic mail message by anyone other than the designated and intended recipients is prohibited. If you have received this electronic mail message in error please reply to or forward a copy of this message to the sender and delete it from your system immediately

Penny Stock Jumping 2000%

Sign up to the #1 voted penny stock newsletter for free today!
AwesomePennyStocks.com