

A wide-angle photograph of a highway interchange with multiple lanes and overpasses, set against a clear sky.

Loop 1604 Environmental Impact Statement Community Advisory Group

Corrected Meeting Summary

January 28, 2010 - 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Valero Corporate Headquarters

Building F – Room FB 118

One Valero Way, San Antonio, Texas 78249

Attendance:

Members: Richard Alles, *Aquifer Guardians in Urban Areas*; Mel Borel, *San Antonio Toll Party*; Letti Bresnahan, *North East Independent School District*; James V. Cannizzo, *Fort Sam Houston/Camp Bullis*; David Hagerman, *Martin Marietta Materials, Inc.*; Barbara Hall, *San Antonio Conservation Society*; Ronnie Hernandez, *San Antonio River Authority*; Michael Hogan, *SAAA - HomeSpring Realty Partners*; Shanna Kilgore, *Valero*; Nolan Kuehn, *Hill Country Bicycle Touring Club*; J. Douglas Lipscomb, *The University of Texas at San Antonio*; Wade McGinnis, *Real Estate Council of San Antonio*; Dick McNary, *North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce*; Cassandra Miller, *Randolph Metrocom Chamber of Commerce*; Debra Morgan, *Alamo Colleges*; William T. Peters, *Northside Independent School District*; Chuck Saxer, *Northside Neighborhoods for Organized Development*; Elena Serna, *Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance*; Chesley Swann, IV, *San Antonio Builders Association*; Mike Villyard, *District 9 Neighborhood Alliance*; Marty Wender, *Westover Hills and the Greater San Antonio Chamber of Commerce*; and Dominic Zickgraf, *Six Flags Fiesta Texas*.

Members of the Public: Beth Tweedy, *Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance*; Tim Sueltenfuss, *Smith Associates*; and Tricia Bruck, *Jacobs*.

Alamo Regional Mobility Authority: Bob Thompson, *Board Member*; Art Downey, *Board Member*; Terry Brechtel, Lisa Adelman, Pat Irwin, PE, Leroy Alloway, and Michelle Martinez.

Michael Baker, Jr., Inc.: Tim Smith, Matt Barkley, Lorraine Richards, Ken Mobley, and Eric Greenman, PE.

RJ RIVERA Associates, Inc.: Linda Vela and Rudy Rivera, PE.

Meeting Objectives:

- Review and comment on draft alternatives screening criteria
- Review and comment on draft alternatives
- Gain an understanding of the draft screening process and its application

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Updated Study Process Diagram and Proposed Schedule for Loop 1604 Environmental Impact Statement
- Public Scoping Meeting #1 Meeting Brief
- Draft Alternatives and Screening Criteria Presentation
- Initial Draft Screening Results and Recommendations

Welcome and Introductions

Lorraine Richards, facilitator with Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., opened the meeting and invited Terry Brechtel, Executive Director with the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority, to address the group. Ms. Brechtel thanked everyone for attending and informed the group that their feedback was critical, especially at this stage in the process. She updated the group regarding the possible extension of the study limits beyond Potranco Road to US 90 and thanked Bob Thompson, Board Member with the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority for his involvement with this group.

Ms. Richards then reviewed the objectives and agenda for the meeting. The Community Advisory Group members introduced themselves. During the introductions, Art Downey informed the group that he was recently appointed to the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority Board of Directors. As a result, Mike Villyard would take his place on the Community Advisory Group as the District 9 Neighborhood Alliance representative.

Ms. Richards introduced Ken Mobley, facilitator with Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., and explained that he would lead the group through some discussions and help the group achieve the meeting objectives. Mr. Mobley explained that he provides leadership and management for public involvement programs and presentations across a variety of Michael Baker Jr., Inc. projects and internal business initiatives. He then summarized the phone interviews that he conducted with Community Advisory Group members since the last meeting. Following are the points he covered.

- **Roles and Responsibilities:** Several advisory group members said they needed clarification of their roles and responsibilities. He said the primary role of the group is to serve as a sounding board for the study team and the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority and as a conduit of information to and from the groups they represent.
- **Diversity:** The diversity of the group was also discussed. He said participation in the group offers a variety of perspectives that help shape the process as it progresses. He said he did not expect the group to agree all the time.
- **Voting:** Mr. Mobley said the group would not engage in a voting process. He further explained that if the group does come together on a recommendation, the study team would be open to receiving it. He said the group was an opportunity for the study team and the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority to listen to issues and concerns and to share information.


- **Ground Rules:** Some members noticed that the ground rules were not followed by everyone in the first meeting. The ground rules were displayed on a board for all to view throughout the meeting. Mr. Mobley said he plans to ensure the rules are respected. He also informed the group that they need to be open to the diverse opinions expressed at the meeting.
- **Schedule:** A concern regarding the schedule was also expressed. There was a desire to shorten the schedule to relieve Loop 1604 congestion sooner. He said that the study team and the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority were sensitive to the schedule and would do everything possible to expedite the process. As an example of how the schedule is being expedited, he said the group would be reviewing materials that evening that typically are covered in three separate meetings.
- **Need and Purpose:** Mr. Mobley said the group was in general agreement regarding the need and purpose for the Loop 1604 study. He said this agreement is good because alternatives are developed based on the need and purpose.
- **How Input is Used:** Mr. Mobley concluded by saying that group members also wanted to know how their input would be used. They did not want to be used to “rubber stamp” the study. To this, he said that the input received at tonight’s meeting would directly affect the alternative screening process. He told the group they would be asked to consider the draft alternatives and screening criteria and identify what is missing or what needs to be added. He then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Richards.

Approval of the Meeting Summary

Ms. Richards explained that the team submitted the meeting summary for the meeting held on September 29, 2009 for review by the group. She said that the study team has not received any comments, and so the summary is considered approved without objection. She said the group would be using the same process on future meeting summaries. She encouraged the group to review the summaries when they are sent out and notify the team if there are any questions or concerns as soon as possible so they can be corrected, if needed, in advance of meetings.

Where We are Today

Ms. Richards then introduced Tim Smith, Project Manager with Michael Baker, Jr., Inc. Mr. Smith updated the group on the study process. Mr. Smith reviewed two of the handouts distributed. He first reviewed the briefing of Public Scoping Meeting #1 held last October. He said there were two meetings held with over 100 people attending and 300 comments. He noted that comments were currently being incorporated into the study process. One of the modifications resulting from this feedback is that the study team is providing more detail on the need and purpose. Another action resulting from comments received to date was to invite the Department of the Army (Jim Cannizzo from Camp Bullis) as a participating agency. He recognized and thanked Mr. Cannizzo for his participation. Mr. Smith also noted that as a result of feedback, the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority is including technical drainage and water quality studies to better quantify impacts to the Edwards Aquifer associated with any of the alternatives considered during the study process.

A wide-angle photograph of a multi-level highway interchange with several lanes of traffic and greenery in the background.

Mr. Smith then reviewed the Loop 1604 Environmental Impact Statement study process flow chart. He said that it is essentially a three-part process – data gathering and problem formulation, developing a solution, and documentation. He said that during documentation, the study team would pull everything into the Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Smith noted that steps that are currently active are highlighted in yellow. He said the goal is to have a Draft Environmental Impact Statement by winter of 2011. Mr. Mobley then asked if anyone had any questions. A question was asked about the screening criteria. Mr. Mobley responded that this would be covered as part of the Technical Presentation in the next agenda item.

Technical Presentation - Screening and Draft Alternatives

Matt Barkley, Deputy Project Manager with Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., began the technical presentation by outlining the general process used to screen alternatives. He emphasized that the primary focus of this meeting is to discuss the draft alternatives and screening criteria and that the information presented is just intended to put something on paper to help everyone think through and provide meaningful feedback. He explained that overall the process is to identify a need and then develop a solution to meet that need. For Loop 1604, he said that generally everyone agrees that the congestion is there and that it causes many accidents with some even referring to Loop 1604 as the “death loop.”

Mr. Barkley said the first step is to determine the range of reasonable solutions and then funnel those down to more tangible options later in the process. He said this range of reasonable alternatives is focused on different types of transportation modes that might work and that the alternatives would not be very detailed at this point in the process.

Richard Alles, representing the Aquifer Guardians in Urban Areas, wanted to know why the problem statement does not include any environmental concerns. He said that many of the people around the table were there because a large part of the project is located over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone. He said that many of the test wells with issues of concern are near Loop 1604. He said the general location of the transportation project is an issue.

Mr. Barkley said that environmental issues are sometimes part of the problem statement and sometimes they are not. He said this is ultimately up to the lead agency. He said that currently, there is not an environmental component in the problem statement but that the lead agencies understand it is an issue and concern. Mr. Alles followed up by saying that the contamination generated by the roadway is a problem and should be included in the problem statement. Mr. Barkley explained that although it is not in the problem statement it is still considered in the process.

Mr. Alles asked if the Federal Highway Administration is being given information conveyed by the Community Advisory Group. Mr. Barkley said that the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority is a joint lead agency and are present at the meeting. He also said the Federal Highway Administration and the Texas Department of Transportation are receiving and reviewing information as it is generated by the study team.

Mr. Smith said the aquifer issue will be addressed throughout this effort. He said it would be further evaluated for all alternatives considered in greater detail. Mr. Alles asked if that would include urbanization of the area that could be induced by Loop 1604 improvements. Mr. Smith responded that this would be part of the evaluation of indirect and cumulative impacts.

Bill Peters, representing Northside Independent School District, asked if there was a full page handout of the process slide available. Mr. Barkley said the presentation is included as part of the handouts and a full page version was sent out by email for review prior to the meeting.

Mr. Barkley continued by explaining that an important part at this early stage is the term reasonable. He explained that the term reasonable really has two components. First, it needs to be practical given modern technology and second, is it needs to be feasible in terms of having the ability to pay for it. He said mass transit is a consideration, along with system and demand management, building a new location roadway, and upgrading what is out there today.

Mr. Mobley then asked Mr. Barkley to give an example of an unreasonable alternative. Mr. Barkley said that building a 35 mile tunnel under what is currently out there would probably be unreasonable due to exorbitant costs and tremendous impacts to the environment. Since no questions were raised, Mr. Barkley continued with the presentation.

The first alternative Mr. Barkley covered was the No Build. He said this option is essentially what you see out there today with no action, except continuing with current maintenance and operations. The No Build is included to provide a baseline for comparison. He then talked about the two forms of upgrading the existing roadway. The first would be to make improvements within existing right of way. The second would be a new location roadway that runs parallel to Loop 1604.

Mr. Barkley said that under mass transit, the study team would consider expanding the existing bus service, bus rapid transit, dedicated bus lanes, light rail, heavy rail, and commuter rail. He then went on to discuss transportation management. He said this concept is harder to explain because the improvements have to do with different types of behaviors that people or corporations can adopt, such as flexible work hours and telecommuting. These behaviors can help reduce traffic but no single agency can really implement these types of changes. It is up to individuals, employers, and corporations. He said another option is to manage development through land use controls. Mr. Barkley then explained that systems management includes improvements like the superstreet concept that is under evaluation now for the US 281 corridor. These types of improvements have to do with maximizing the existing system through operational improvements. He then opened the floor for questions. Following are the questions and comments raised.

- Mr. Alles said that it seems like the study team is attempting to identify solutions before defining the problem. He said he thought the origin and destination information should be part of the problem formulation. Mr. Barkley said that the study team is looking at

origin and destination data as part of the current work being done to establish the baseline for comparison (No Build).

- Mel Borel, representing the San Antonio Toll Party, asked if the study team would have traffic studies and be able to identify traffic patterns as part of this effort. Mr. Barkley said they would be able to and that they are already seeing that most trips along the corridor consist of three stage trips: 1) the route taken to get to Loop 1604; 2) the portion of the trip on Loop 1604; and 3) the portion of the trip on another route to get to destination.
- J. Douglas Lipscomb, representing the University of Texas San Antonio, asked about the typical travel distance on Loop 1604. Mr. Barkley noted that studies are on-going and that the study team should be able provide this information at the next meeting.

Mr. Mobley asked if there were other types of alternatives that the group would like considered. Following are the responses provided by different members of the group.

- Mr. Alles asked if a new location alternative could include expanding existing roads. He asked the study team to consider whether the demand could be met by improving another road or other roads in the area.
- Dominic Zigraf, representing Six Flags Fiesta Texas, asked if the new location option would be like running a Wurzbach Parkway parallel to Loop 1604. The response was yes.
- Elena Serna, representing the Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance, asked if the ultimate outcome could be a combination of the various alternatives. The study team said this would be possible and emphasized that that Alamo Regional Mobility Authority is looking towards a multi-modal solution to solve the problems with the Loop 1604 corridor.
- Mr. Lipscomb suggested looking at running mass transit as a parallel system rather than along the corridor. He did not want to limit the mass transit options to just the Loop 1604 corridor. Ms. Brechtel said VIA Metropolitan Transit is currently looking at their long-range transportation plan and that they are involved as a participating agency in this process.
- Mr. Peters had a comment on the scope of the study. He said Loop 1604 exists within a larger transportation network, especially on the side of town between IH 10 to US 90. He said the study team should look at Loop 1604 in the context of where people live and what routes they take to get to Loop 1604. He said a perfect example is the intersection of Loop 1604 and SH 151. This area will eventually be expanded to SH 211 so there will be an outer, outer loop at least in this area. He further said that his school district is estimating that one out of every two homes being built in Bexar County is in this area and this needs to be seriously considered. Mr. Barkley said the traffic studies include an evaluation of a Transportation Analysis Study Area which extends well beyond the Loop 1604 corridor with the intent to capture this type of information and show how people travel in this part of the region.

Mr. Mobley then asked Mr. Barkley to talk about the limits of the traffic study. Mr. Barkley said the Traffic Analysis Study Area includes a significant area on either side of Loop 1604 but that he did not have the exact limits available at the meeting.

Mr. Mobley then asked if everyone understood the concept of transportation systems management and demand management, and specifically the superstreet example provided. Eric Greenman, with Michael Baker, Jr., Inc. was then asked to explain the superstreet concept in greater detail. He said it is essentially providing a roadway with no left turns. He said this helps eliminate conflict points and should allow traffic to flow better and safer. Dick McNary, representing the North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce, said that this would be similar to driving on Wurzbach Parkway between Lockhill Selma and Blanco. Ms. Richards noted that the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority website also includes some good visualizations of the proposed US 281 superstreets. Ms. Brechtel then said that the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority is also working with the San Antonio-Bexar County Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Texas Department of Transportation to apply some of these concepts to portions of Loop 1604 as an interim solution. She said they plan to meet with them January 29, 2010, to lay out some concepts that could provide interim relief.

Mr. Barkley then went on to describe the screening process. He likened it to sifting something through a screen with different size holes. He said during the first phase of screening, the holes are pretty big. He said the screening criteria are essentially developed by answering questions related to who, what, when, where, why and how. He said the need and purpose is the what, why, and where. The questions of when and where speak to the planning and programming component. The “who” are the environmental and community concerns such as the Edwards Aquifer and what is important to the community.

He said that the criteria may be deleted, added, or modified based on the group’s feedback. He explained that the criteria are set up to be simple yes/no type questions that allow alternatives to be evaluated based on whether they “do” or “do not” address them. He then reviewed the specific criteria. The first two are associated with congestion relief, specifically reducing bottlenecks and choke points and shortening the amount of time it takes to drive from one point to another. The next group of criteria relate to reducing the number of conflict points, or potential crash points.

Mr. Barkley said criteria 5 and 6 involve local transportation planning. He said the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority wants to be consistent with existing plans. They also want to develop a solution soon because the problems are out there now. He said it is important to be able to do something sooner rather than later and to have the ability to provide a multimodal solution. He then said that the last four criteria (7-10) deal with community and environmental issues. He said these include minimizing the effects to threatened and endangered species and habitat and preserving water quality and quantity within the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone.

Mr. Mobley then asked the group to provide comments/concerns regarding the criteria and if they thought that anything was missing. Following are the comments, questions, and concerns raised by individual group members.

- Mr. Cannizzo asked that a criterion be added related to preserving Camp Bullis' ability to carry out its mission. For example, light pollution is an existing problem that they are working on.
- Michael Hogan, representing the San Antonio Apartment Association, asked if there would be any impacts to Camp Bullis if the improvements stayed within existing right of way through that area. Mr. Cannizzo said the only thing that would be an issue is lighting. Mr. Barkley said this could be mitigated and Mr. Cannizzo agreed.
- Debra Morgan, representing the Alamo Colleges, expressed that improving air quality should be included under the Community and Environment set of criteria.
- Wade McGinnis, representing the Real Estate Council of San Antonio, also asked that some language be added about air quality.
- Mr. Hogan said he did not know how Loop 1604 could affect air quality alone. He said that air quality is a community-wide issue.
- Jon Thompson, representing the Aquifer Guardians in Urban Areas, said there should be some language about how long a solution would solve the problem for (e.g., 20 years, 50 years).
- Mr. Lipscomb said that it was important to consider the cumulative effect. Even though the study only deals with one road, its contribution to worsened air quality should not be ignored. He would also like to create a criteria such as "does the proposed solution expand access and mobility" to expand who can use the system since not everyone can drive. He feels that it is important to evaluate heavy and light rail as alternatives past this stage. He also said the study team should look at the economic impacts of each solution. For example, the long-term maintenance and operations costs, as well as economic cost to neighborhoods. [Examples of economic costs were clarified by Mr. Lipscomb in a followup e-mail message and include the cost of maintaining and policing the roadway, cost of air quality deterioration, cost of car ownership and operation (purchase, fuel, repairs and insurance), cost of accidents (in terms of property damage, medical and loss of life).]
- Mr. Borel said that in terms of economic impact, some people cannot afford to pay tolls.
- Cassandra Miller, representing Randolph Metrocom Chamber of Commerce, asked how the study team would account for future growth and further how that could be screened. She specifically wanted to know how to do that given that the city cannot control land use in the county. Mr. Barkley said that this would be addressed by looking at existing land use and how it is projected to change. Ms. Miller said she was particularly concerned because there are areas of town that no one even visits anymore because the region has historically not done a good job of anticipating growth.
- Nolan Kuehn, representing the Hill Country Bicycle Touring Club, said he also wants to look at the architectural and community planning to reduce demand. The community can reduce the need for people to travel long stretches by planning for communities that are more self-contained. Mr. Kuehn said the phrase "mixed-use development" captures what

he wants. Mr. McGinnis followed up by saying that transit-oriented development should also be included.

Application of the Screening Process

Mr. Barkley then described the initial screening results. He said that alternatives that score an A-C would pass through to the next level of the alternatives development and screening process. He went through the new location roadway as an example of the scoring. The results and recommendations based on the initial screening were provided to the group in handout form. After Mr. Barkley presented the results, Mr. Mobley opened the floor for discussion. Following are the comments, questions, and concerns expressed by individuals in the group.

- Mr. Downey said that for standalone alternatives, the screening approach makes sense. However, he felt the ultimate solution for Loop 1604 would be a combination of the alternatives mentioned. Mr. Barkley responded that once the study team goes through this first step, the alternatives remaining will be the primary modes to be studied. The end result could be a combination of alternatives.
- Mr. McNary asked how the other alternatives would be considered if they were previously screened out.
- Mr. Downey said he could see developing a prioritized list of individual options. He said in order to do a true screening; you need to evaluate the relationships and the synergy of how the different alternatives work together as solutions.
- Mr. McNary asked if slowing down traffic was a criterion. He said a bus would slow down traffic. Mr. Barkley said buses could be in their own lane.
- Someone asked the study team to explain the difference between light rail and heavy rail. Mr. Mobley said that light rail has greater flexibility in that it is usually 2-3 cars long and can run in mixed traffic at slower speeds. Examples of light rail he cited included Portland and Dallas. Heavy rail refers more to commuter rail or subways. He said heavy rail does not mix with traffic. He also said heavy rail tends to have more distance between stops.
- Ms. Miller asked if Bus Rapid Transit is included in the transit alternative. Mr. Barkley responded that it is one of the choices.
- Mr. Alles asked when the initial screening would be complete. Mr. Barkley said that feedback from the group would be incorporated and the screening updated prior to the next meeting in March.
- Mr. Alles asked the study team to consider the variation on the parallel road concept and investigate a parallel transit corridor and improvements to existing routes.
- Mr. Alles said it appears that all the criteria are pre-weighted based on the number of criteria in each category. He said he wanted to add something that addresses water quality degradation due to point source pollution such as fuel spills from collisions that occur over the recharge zone. He said the current criteria only speak to non-point source pollution.
- Mr. McNary said the study team should at least set aside right of way for a rail system. He said this should not be precluded as a future mode of travel.

- Mr. Borel said light rail would be very beneficial. He said he wanted to see some consideration of a rail provision. He said most cities are moving to get cars off the road.
- Ms. Serna said they want to see the protection of the Edwards Aquifer be a focus of the study and agreed that point source pollution should be part of that.
- Mr. McNary felt that protecting the Edwards Aquifer was more of a design issue. The road is designed so that it does not impact the aquifer.
- Mr. Alles said improving the roadway will increase the number of people moving to the area and increase point source pollution.
- Mr. Hogan said that since Loop 1604 is already there, he believed that whatever is built would be better than what is out there now. He asked if the study team was dealing with the same amount of right of way all along the corridor. Mr. Greenman noted that the right of way width varies considerably throughout the Loop 1604 corridor limits.
- Mr. Hogan said the study team should lean towards expanding the bus system instead of light or heavy rail because it is flexible and it is already in use. He said he liked the idea of dedicated bus lanes. He said many cities are losing money on light rail. He noted that he is not saying there should not be right of way reserved for a future rail system but that for now expanding the bus system makes more sense.
- Marty Wender, representing Westover Hills and the Greater San Antonio Chamber of Commerce, said that VIA Metropolitan Transit is revamping all of their systems. He recommended that someone from VIA Metropolitan Transit be involved and explain to the group the new systems so everyone understands how transit is part of the solution. Ms. Brechtel assured him that VIA Metropolitan Transit has been involved at an agency level. Mr. Wender said everyone needs to understand what VIA Metropolitan Transit is planning. He said you cannot redirect growth by cutting off the expansion of roads. All this does is make an area more congested. He said No Build will not stop the growth. It will just make traffic worse and getting around more difficult.
- Mr. Downey asked if Transportation System and Demand Management included directional lanes and high-occupancy vehicle lanes. Mr. Barkley said that these types of improvements would fall under upgrading the roadway and that they are part of what is being studied as part of a managed lane concept.
- Chuck Saxer, representing the Northside Neighborhoods for Organized Development, said the study team did a great job of establishing draft alternatives and criteria. He said some things do need to be added. He said many members of the group are involved in various plans for different portions of the city trying to consider community living versus urban sprawl. He said the culture is changing but he still does not envision having rail in his lifetime. He said it would be great to have bus service because the area does not even have that.
- Ms. Morgan said that traffic on Loop 1604 is different during the summer when school is out. There needs to be some short-term solutions that could address school traffic. She said she thought people would ride the bus if there was some express bus service on Loop 1604.

- Mr. Peters said that as far as criteria goes, time horizons need to be a consideration. The alternatives development and screening process should factor in how long an alternative would take to implement, how long it will last, and how much it will cost.
- Mr. Thompson said that when considering options, there also needs to be a discussion of what may be precluded by that option.
- Mr. McNary said that water quality / recharge area is very important, even from a development perspective. He said the drinking water source for San Antonio does not require a water treatment plant to make it usable and that is a very valuable resource.
- Mr. Hogan said the team should look at what other roads can be upgraded and not just a new location parallel road.

After hearing from the group, Ms. Brechtel provided some closing thoughts. She said the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority is working with a variety of agencies that are participating and/or cooperating agencies to the process. VIA Metropolitan Transit, the Alamo Area Council of Governments, Camp Bullis, and the City of San Antonio are involved at this level to help the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority stay current on their planning efforts and incorporate information from these plans into the study.

Mr. Alloway restated that the information presented in the meeting was draft to start the discussion. The study team will update the information and show the group how their comments have been used as part of the next meeting. The entire point is to funnel choices down to the most reasonable alternatives so they can be studied in more detail. At the end, the study needs to result in a decision to build, build some combination, or not build. Mr. Barkley commended the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority on their willingness to listen to what people are saying and make changes based on comments. He said Mr. Cannizzo was sitting at the table as a direct result of input received. Mr. Alles asked why the Edwards Aquifer Authority was not part of the group. The study team responded that they are involved as a participating agency.

Wrap-up and Next Steps

Mr. Mobley then reviewed the meeting objectives and outcome of the meeting. Ms. Richards concluded the meeting by encouraging members to contact the study team with any additional comments they may have about what was presented in the meeting or any other questions. She also reviewed the following dates:

- Tentative date for next Community Advisory Group - March 25, 2010
- Tentative dates for second series of scoping meetings - April 12-14, 2010

She also encouraged the advisory group members to contact the study team for presentations to their organizations or to provide them information for their newsletters. The team really appreciates the group's willingness to help get the word out to the public about the study.

Adjourn

This concluded the second meeting of the Loop 1604 Environmental Impact Statement Community Advisory Group.