

**APPENDIX J:  
PUBLIC OUTREACH SUMMARY**

## **APPENDIX J PUBLIC OUTREACH SUMMARY**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Public involvement in the planning of transportation projects is mandated by federal regulation, but is also a core principle of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Therefore, since the first quarter of 2013, the MPO has engaged in a continuous process of outreach associated with the development and adoption of the **2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**. This process began with the approval of a vision statement and goals by the Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC) Transportation Policy Council (TPC), which is composed of representatives from cities, counties and transportation agencies. H-GAC personnel serve as staff and the TPC serves as the policy board for the MPO.

The public outreach process began with outreach sessions convened in January 2013, formally concluded in December 2014 with a public meeting to receive input pertaining to the draft 2040 RTP. Although, public outreach for the 2040 RTP will end at that time, the MPO will continue to engage in ongoing public outreach in conjunction with assess management studies, mobility studies, and other transportation plans and studies.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN**

The Houston-Galveston Area Council 2040 RTP public outreach process was guided by a far-reaching Public Participation Plan (PPP) that enabled the MPO to reach a broad cross section of the eight-county transportation management area. The PPP reflects a public outreach process that is “continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive”, allowing all voices to be heard.

A copy of the PPP is available to the public, upon request. In addition, it can be retrieved at [www.hgac.com/taq/public\\_info/default.aspx](http://www.hgac.com/taq/public_info/default.aspx).

DRAFT

## **PUBLIC OUTREACH METHODS**

H-GAC provided persons residing in the eight county transportation management area covered by the MPO with opportunities to engage in the planning process for the 2040 RTP. To ensure maximum public input, H-GAC:

- Executed early and continuous involvement of the public in an open, inclusive public outreach process;
- Engaged in aggressive techniques utilized for identifying civic leaders, public officials, and others that have a stake in the outcomes reflected in the plan;
- Adopted effective methods of informing the public of RTP meetings, activities and milestones, including telephone, mail, and email outreach to civic leaders, placement of meeting notices in public gathering places, and follow-up correspondence after meetings were adopted;
- Focused its efforts to reach out to underserved citizens, including low income and minority populations, representatives of disabled persons, seniors, and other groups that have not typically had the opportunity to participate in the regional transportation planning process;
- Implemented ongoing coordination with organizations that represent the interests of environmental justice populations, including professional associations, chambers of commerce, super neighborhood councils, civic clubs and civic organizations, nonprofit social service organizations, and the faith community;
- Ensured that meeting locations and times were convenient, including giving presentations at the regular meeting times and venues of civic groups and public entities and piggybacking onto other presentations related to transportation, such as the SH 49 Access Management Study and the Missouri City Pedestrian-Bicyclist Study;
- Provided ample opportunities to respond and provide comments, including question-answer periods following presentations and the use of surveys and comment cards;
- Organized and presented information and data in an easy-to-understand format that focused on the key issues and alternatives under consideration; and,
- Established and maintained strong rapport and ongoing communication with the general public, underserved populations, elected officials, and public sector entities, and public agencies to keep them apprised of project milestones and activities;

DRAFT

- Leveraged relationships with area partners such as professional associations, business management districts, community based organizations, chambers of commerce, and others to gain their involvement and support for engaging their memberships and constituencies; and
- Developed positive and reciprocally beneficial relationships with the news media.
- Responded to feedback received from members of the public, elected and appointed officials, and stakeholder organizations.

## **PUBLIC OUTREACH PROCESS**

As demonstrated by the foregoing, H-GAC committed to a comprehensive public outreach process designed to achieve broad-based input. Public outreach sessions targeted the following groups:

- Elected and Appointed Officials
- Business, chamber of commerce, and transportation organizations
- Under-served or Environmental Justice (EJ) populations, including , low-income households, members of minority groups, zero-automobile households, elderly persons, persons with limited educational attainment, and persons with limited English proficiency. These are the populations targeted for the EJ analysis that is discussed in this document.

### **First Round of Outreach Sessions**

Initial outreach to the public occurred in 2013. This outreach featured presentations to organizations throughout the MPO's transportation management area. Components of these presentations included:

- Slide presentation describing the RTP process, regional trends, the current system, and proposed projects
- A hand-out with information on how to gain access to the RTP website and to a telephone hotline to submit comments
- Guidance on where to gain access to an online survey
- Question/answer and comment period

In addition, at EJ meetings, paper surveys were administered. The results of these surveys have been compiled and serve as an input to the EJ section of this document.

DRAFT

An inventory of the first round of public outreach meetings, of which there were 31, follows.

### **Elected Officials**

- Chambers County Commissioners Court, January 22, 2013
- Liberty County Commissioners Court, January 22, 2013
- Montgomery County Commissioners Court, January 28, 2013
- Fort Bend County Commissioners Court, February 5, 2013
- Waller County Commissioners Court, February 6, 2013
- Brazoria County Commissioners Court, February 12, 2013
- Galveston County Commissioners Court, February 19, 2013

### **Business, Chamber, and Transportation Organizations**

- 288 Partnership Transportation Subcommittee, January 9, 2013
- Waller Economic Development Council, January 15, 2013
- Fort Bend County Economic Development Council, January 17, 2013
- West Houston Association Transportation Committee, January 17, 2013
- Women In Transportation, January 17, 2013
- North Houston Association, February 6, 2013
- Prairie View Economic Development, February 14, 2013
- Highway 249 Corridor Coalition, February 21, 2013
- Clear Lake Area Chamber of Commerce, February 27, 2013
- The Woodlands Area Chamber of Commerce, March 19, 2013
- Katy Area Chamber of Commerce, March 20, 2013
- Pearland Chamber of Commerce, March 21, 2013
- Baytown West Chambers County Economic Development Foundation, March 25, 2013
- West Chambers County Chamber of Commerce, April 9, 2013

### **Organizations Representing Under-Served Populations**

- Concerned Citizens of Conroe, January 17, 2013
- Northeast Concerned Citizens Civic League, January 28, 2013

DRAFT

- Houston Housing Authority Residents Council, February 15, 2013
- Cleveland Senior Citizens Organization, February 18, 2013
- Chambers County Wellness Center, February 22, 2013
- Missouri City Pedestrian/Bicyclist Study Open House, March 5, 2013
- ESL Class at Baker-Ripley Center, March 6, 2013
- Houston Commission on Disabilities, March 14, 2013
- Galveston NAACP, March 14, 2013
- Neighborhood Centers Ripley House, April 5, 2013

## **Second Round of Public Outreach Sessions**

Beginning in the summer of 2014 and ending in January 2015, H-GAC conducted additional outreach. At these meetings, H-GAC staff provided information regarding the 2040 RTP and solicited feedback.

### **PUBLIC MEETINGS**

As before, during this period, H-GAC met with elected and appointed officials; business, chamber, civic, and transportation Groups; and groups that represent under-served populations. Following is an inventory of these meetings, of which there were 21.

#### **Elected and Appointed Officials**

- City of Conroe City Council, August 13, 2014
- City of Baytown City Council, August 14, 2014
- City of Kendleton, August 28, 2014

#### **Business, Chamber, and Transportation Groups**

- Texas Commercial Carrier Association, May 17, 2014
- Greater Fort Bend Economic Development Council, May 22, 2014
- Houston Tomorrow Livable Houston Initiative, May 28, 2014
- Greater 288 Partnership Transportation Committee, May 29, 2014
- Houston East End Chamber of Commerce, June 11, 2014
- Pearland Chamber of Commerce, July 10, 2014
- Pasadena Rotary Club, July 18, 2014

DRAFT

- North Houston Association Transportation Committee, August 6, 2014
- Houston Northwest Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee, August 20, 2014
- Baytran – Bay Area Houston Transportation Partnership, September 17, 2014
- Liberty County Open House and Public Meeting, November 12, 2014
- Harris County/Houston Open House and Public Meeting, November 13, 2014
- Brazoria County Open House and Public Meeting, November 18, 2014

### **Organizations Representing Under-Served Population**

- Neighborhood Centers Inc. Baker-Ripley Community Center, April 29, 2014
- Neighborhood Centers Inc. Ripley House, June 4, 2014
- Camara de Empresarios Latinos de Houston, June 26, 2014
- Independence Heights Super Neighborhood Council, July 21, 2014
- Northeast Concerned Citizens Civic League, July 28, 2014

### **FINAL ROUND OF PUBLIC OUTREACH SESSIONS**

As the planning process neared an end, H-GAC convened seven open houses that could be attended by any member of the public. The purpose of the open houses was to inform participants of proposed transportation improvements and secure written and verbal comments regarding what was presented.

In line with H-GAC's commitment to inclusion, under-served populations were the focus of the majority of these events, based on the fact that EJ populations are more likely to be affected by the digital divide, making them less likely to be in a position to provide online input.

Display boards that contained information pertaining to RTP goals, performance measures, the existing system, proposed transportation improvements, and current and projected regional demographics, were created and exhibited at these open houses and comment cards were secured via comment cards distributed to persons in attendance. At the meeting held in Montgomery County, display boards pertaining to the South Montgomery County Mobility Study were also exhibited and the H-GAC staff person in charge of the study was present to provide information and receive feedback.

H-GAC convened the following open houses:

- Galveston County Open House, Old Central Cultural Center, Galveston County, November 13, 2014

DRAFT

- Joint SH 249 Access Management Study/RTP Public Meeting, Hill Intermediate School, November 13, 2014
- Waller County Open House, Prairie View A&M Student Center, November 19, 2014
- Waller County Open House, Prairie View City Hall, Waller County, November 19, 2014
- Montgomery County Open House, Montgomery County Library - Main Branch, December 9, 2014
- Harris County Open House, Baytown City Hall Complex, December 11, 2014
- Harris County Open House, Houston-Galveston Area Council, December 17, 2014 (Noon to 1:00 p.m.)
- Harris County Open House, Houston-Galveston Area Council, (6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.)

## **PUBLIC INPUT**

Comments were received verbally, provided in written form on comment cards distributed at public meetings and open houses, and transmitted via electronic mail and letter. A total of 234 comment cards were collected from participants at meetings held in 2013. The majority of persons who completed comment cards requested to be added to the mailing list. Comments written in Spanish were translated and summarized along with English language comments received. An additional 129 comment cards were received at meetings held from April 2014 to early January 2015. These comment cards have been archived and are available at H-GAC.

The official comment period commenced on November 24, 2014 and ended on January 9, 2015. The public was notified of the comment period by publication of notice in the newspaper of general circulation that serves the eight-county transportation management area and by the posting of a notice on the H-GAC website. Comments received during the official public comment period, which commenced on November 24, 2014 and ended on January 9, 2015, are depicted in **Exhibit A**. H-GAC's responses are also depicted.

As shown in **Exhibit A**, official comments were submitted by the City of Houston, Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County (METRO), Gulf Coast Rail District, Air Alliance Houston, Sierra Club, Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Bike Houston, and others.



DRAFT

A review of the commentary that was provided indicates that key aspirations for commenters include:

- Increased expenditures for public transportation/transit, including bus, rail, and pedestrian/bicyclist facilities
- Improvements to public transportation/transit
- Enhanced access to Houston from smaller communities in the eight-county transportation management area
- Transportation to social services and health care for under-served populations
- Additional measures to reduce congestion
- Road maintenance

Commenters also requested specific projects and made recommendations for improvements to specific geographic areas, including:

- Synchronize lights along US 90 through Dayton; Bike path adjacent to US 90 connecting Liberty and Dayton.
- Continue expansion of US290 from FM 2920 to SH 6 in Hempstead with improvements at SH 6.
- Desire for rail transit along IH 10.
- Include the projects identified in H-GAC's West Houston Mobility Study.
- Extend Chimney Rock to Orem to help alleviate traffic on South Post Oak during rush hour.
- Repair Alameda Road between Old Spanish Trail and MacGregor Drive sooner; that street is in bad condition (especially in front of the VA Hospital).
- Fund express bus or train service between Prairie View and Houston.
- Complete 36A.
- Continue expansion of US290 from FM 2920 to SH 6 in Hempstead with improvement at SH 6.
- Implement mass transportation for Eldridge @ Parkway Plaza, close to the I10 and Highway 6 area.
- Extend commuter rail to The Woodlands.
- The US 290 corridor needs more toll lanes in order to serve public transit, carpool, and vanpools.
- Use parkometers that can be a source of income for the city transportation system.
- Do not construct roads so close to or through the Katy Prairie Preserve (Hwy 36 or Hwy 36A).
- The port connector routes of 36 and 36A are problematic from my standpoint.....the Katy Prairie is a unique habitat for migrating waterfowl which is being destroyed by the Grand Parkway and the expansion of Katy...
- Include data from a survey completed by the OST/South Union Super Neighborhood in future planning and discussion opportunities.

DRAFT

- It appears that the Northeast quadrant of Houston was largely overlooked with regards to thoroughfare improvements. There is an enormous amount of growth occurring in the Lake Houston area including multiple residential communities and the 4,000 acre commercial development, Generation Park. At McCord Development, we would like to see more consideration for the Lake Houston area, including the North Lake Houston Parkway connection between the west and east sides of the lake. We feel these connections are critical for the future growth of the area.
- There should be more projects in the Northeast corridor/Kashmere Gardens area -- that includes sidewalks, improved boulevards, and streets.
- Include the northeast area, IH-10/59/610.
- Include an alternate route from Anahuac to the Houston area that doesn't add an additional 25 miles to the trip.
- Grand Parkway should skew further east to connect with SH321 and elevate traffic in Downtown Dayton
- Any plans for a bypass in Dayton?
- Dayton is in need of a Park & Ride to facilitate motorist commuting to Houston and Baytown.
- Galveston to Houston railway
- Light rail from Galveston to Houston
- Incorporate smart roadway systems and make accommodations for electric cars.
- Bus service between the city of Galveston and Houston's Downtown Metro station, Houston Hobby, and George Bush-Intercontinental Airport
- Bus service inside of the city of Galveston
- Island Transit connection to METRO downtown transit center
- Commuter rail from Galveston to Houston
- Widen SH 288
- More buses coming from the Brazosport area to Houston, Galveston, San Antonio
- More lighting on bike paths in Brazos County leading to places
- More buses in Waller County and bus stop coverings
- More bike lanes in Prairie View
- Bus transportation from Prairie View to Houston or Dallas
- Public transportation from Prairie View to Cypress area
- Interchange roads proximate to Prairie View
- High speed rail from Houston to Dallas
- Train in Baytown area for commuters

DRAFT

Comments made during the official public comment period received a response from H-GAC. These comments and responses are archived at H-GAC and are available to the public upon request.

## MEETING DOCUMENTATION

In addition to comments received, summaries of meeting proceedings and sign-in sheets are archived at H-GAC. These documents are available to the public upon request.

## PUBLICITY AND MEETING NOTIFICATIONS

The 2040 RTP website, online survey, and public outreach sessions were publicized through the following avenues:

- Postings on:
  - Chron.com Blog
  - Guidrynews.comHoustonTomorrow.com
  - Impactnews.com
  - katychamber.com
  - University of Houston-Clear Lake Environmental Institute of Houston
  - yourhoustonnews.com
  - yoursugarlandnews.com
- Articles in the following publications:
  - *Cypress Creek Mirror*, "H-GAC seeking input on 2040 Regional Transportation Plan," Friday, February 22, 2013
  - *Community Impact Newspaper, Tomball/Magnolia*, "H-GAC to update transportation plan, projects Houston population increase of 3.3 million by 2040," February 22, 2013
- E-blasts to members of:
  - CREW
  - Highway 249 Corridor Coalition
  - Houston Commission on Disabilities
  - Waller Economic Development Council
  - Women in Transportation
  - Montgomery County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
  - Prairie View Economic Development 4B Corporation
- Letters to members of:
  - Conroe Concerned Citizens

DRAFT

- Galveston County NAACP
- Prairie View Economic Development Council
  
- Flyers sent to members of organizations that represent underserved persons, public agencies, and service providers
  
- Telephone contact with:
  - Montgomery County United Way
  - Prairie View Economic Development Council
  - Montgomery County Public Library
  - Missouri City Planning Department
  - Northeast Concerned Citizens
  
  - Houston Housing Authority
  - Houston Commission on Disabilities
  
- Video Presentation

H-GAC posted a video of the presentation in English and Spanish on YouTube.com. The television station Univision aired an interview in Spanish with, Marco Bracamontes, H-GAC Manager of Public Outreach. The interview was also posted on H-GAC's YouTube page.

**EXHIBIT A**  
**Draft 2040 RTP Summary of Comments**

Comment Source	Comments Summary	Response to Comments
Public Meeting Liberty, TX	Transit connection between Liberty/Dayton and Houston; Synchronize lights along US 90 through Dayton; Bike path adjacent to US 90 connecting Liberty and Dayton.	
Public Meeting <i>Joint SH249 AMS &amp; RTP public meeting</i>	Support for safety improvement for all users; Support for access management	
Public Meeting Galveston, TX	Transit connection between Houston and Galveston	
Public Meeting Lake Jackson, TX	Freeway connection between Alvin and Houston	
Prairie View Public Mtgs Prairie View, TX	Express bus or train service between Prairie View and Houston; Complete 36A; Continue expansion of US290 from FM 2920 to SH 6 in Hempstead with improvement at SH 6	
Public Meeting Conroe, TX	Attendees were pleased with plan recommendations; Considerations for special populations such as seniors and disabled should be emphasized.	
Public Meeting Baytown, TX	Plan must address transportation choices for those that need to get to social services, and other basic needs as well as service between Houston and Baytown; Plan should include a train in the Baytown area for commuters; Additional highway capacity at major intersections;	
Public Meetings (2) H-GAC	Noon Meeting -- (Noon-1:00 p.m.) Brandt Mannchen comment letter (separate attachment).	Response prepared by Hans-Michael.

Public Meeting <i>Joint Access Mgmt Study &amp; 2040 RTP Public Meeting</i>	Support and desire for rail transit along IH 10; need for additional thoroughfare improvements including expansions and grade separations; support for safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle accommodations	
TxDOT Comments	The Congestion Management Process (CMP) is not mentioned as playing a role in project selection for the region; CFR requires projects that result from a CMP be identified in MTPs. No discussion on high impact environmental mitigation activities/techniques for the region No real discussion (other than Prop 1) of additional funding opportunities or mechanisms for the region; this could be things such as 380 agreements, TRIZ, tax on vehicle miles traveled, etc. Document (including Appendices) references 2015\$ in the Financial Constraint section; CFR requires all revenue and cost estimates to reflect year-of-expenditure dollars; No discussion of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) and how it is tied to strategies for the H-GAC region; Additionally, the document is lacking discussion on emergency relief, disaster preparedness, and homeland security elements.	
Clark Martinson Comments (Intermodal Interests)	Include the projects identified in H-GAC's West Houston Mobility Study. The West Houston Study suggested circulating bus service at The Energy Corridor, Westchase and Memorial Districts. Specifically transform the Addicks P&R from a parking lot with downtown bus service to a transit center with parking for bus service to multiple business centers and local bus service serving The Energy Corridor residents and businesses. Also, provide new P&R lots along the Grand Parkway and offer shuttle bus service from them to west Houston business centers. In addition, provide high capacity transit service along IH 10 from Sealy to downtown with transit stations at Katy, The Energy Corridor, Memorial City, the Northwest transit Center and downtown.	
Gulf Coast Rail District	Letter from Maureen Crocker to Alan (Separate attachment.)	Response prepared by Hans-Michael.
Public Comments Inbox	I have had a great interest in our TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM BEING DONE RIGHT SINCE THE MID 80'S and wonder why I was not notified by HGAC of your latest meetings. I am sure I am on you your list -or was on it. What is the latest 40 year proposal?	
	I would like to see Chimney Rock extended to Orem to help alleviate traffic on S Post Oak during rush hour. I would also like to see Almeda between Old Spanish Trail and MacGregor Dr. repaired sooner, that street is in bad condition (especially in front of the VA Hospital).	I forwarded your comment to the City of Houston as the facilities you reference are maintained locally. It will be also included in our records. Thoroughfare development and facility maintenance are important components of the plan. Thanks for your participation.

	<p>We live in the energy corridor and disappointed to know that there is no mass transportation planned for the Eldridge @ parkway plaza, close to I10 and hwy 6 area.</p>	<p>We have worked to highlight the importance of mass transit as one of the priorities in the 2040 RTP. Since the plan is very high-level, it may be less apparent as to how some of the recommendations apply to the local level. Currently, H-GAC is partnering with the several local entities, including the City of Houston, on the West Houston Mobility Study; in addition, we recently completed a subregional planning study with Fort Bend County and other partners. Both of the studies provide recommendations for transit in and to the West Houston area. You can find information about each study at this link: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/taq/sub_regional/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/taq/sub_regional/default.aspx</a> As part of the plan H-GAC developed a "vision map" (which can be seen on the last page of the document, pg25) which includes both funded projects and unfunded project recommendations. The unfunded project recommendations were included to provide clearer picture into identified transportation needs, this includes potential high-capacity transit along the Katy Freeway Corridor. It is possible that some of the recommendations from both studies be included in future versions of the RTP. I have also forwarded your email to Metro.</p>
	<p>Suggest the commuter rail service be extended out to The Woodlands. I live in Shenandoah and would use bike corridors and light rail service for transportation needs, if they are made available in Shenandoah/The Woodlands.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. H-GAC is currently partnering with Montgomery County, The Woodland Township and others on the South Montgomery Mobility Plan and The Woodlands Transit Plan both studies will recommend projects to improve mobility in your area. Some of the project recommendations may also be considered for inclusion in future versions of the RTP. You can find information about the studies here: <a href="http://montgomerycountymobility.com/">http://montgomerycountymobility.com/</a></p>
	<p>The US 290 corridor needs more toll lanes in order to serve public transit, carpool, and vanpools. The HOT lanes on the I-10 are great. It is going to cause great problems to grow the lanes for Single Occupant Vehicles (SOVs), while not growing capacity for buses, carpools, and vanpools. I thought we learned a long time ago that we could not build our way out of our congestion problem by laying down more "free" concrete for SOVs. When you make a public resource available for free, it gets totally consumed by the demand, in fact it creates BEW demand, and you find you haven't made any long-term improvements, you've only made the problem worse. This is exactly what will happen, unfortunately.</p>	<p>This comment was forwarded to TXDoT.</p>

	<p>I have attended meetings in the past on the RTP 2040 and would be very ANGRY to see a "late addition through the back door" of the 36A Coalition project APPEAR in the plan. Another obligation and lack of local publication of the RT Mtg. kept me from attending the meeting at the Prairie View City Hall on Wednesday evening.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. 36A is not included in the 2040 RTP.</p>
	<p>METRO and Public Transportation: We can't expect people to choose METRO over driving simply because they are trying to be better citizens. It should make sense and be a better choice than driving a car for METRO to become popular. As long as Houston Building Codes requires large parking lots and garages, it is cheaper and simpler to take a car. METRO has become synonymous with being poor or crazy. There could be dramatic improvements in urban parking systems with modern and simple to use parkometers that can be a source of income for the city transportation system. While the light rail system needs to grow towards the more populated parts of Houston, the Bus systems needs to improve dramatically. Bus stops need to be more than just a simple sign. There are state of the art bus stops in places like River Oaks and Medical Center but there are people who are waiting under hundred degree Fahrenheit sun to get on the bus in other areas.</p> <p>Bike Lanes: No one can possibly imagine using bike lanes next to roads where cars and trucks drive up to 60mph (example: N Eldridge between I10 and W Little York) There is nothing to protect the cyclist and the number of white bicycles, painted white in remembrance of a dead cyclist in on the rise. Bike lanes aren't only for a Sunday morning biking for recreational reasons. Bike lanes should be useful and safe. Houston has 300 miles of bike lanes but are they really useful or safe? No. They are death traps to scare people from cycling anywhere.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. I forwarded them to METRO and the City of Houston. Both of these entities are working on efforts to address some of your concerns. METRO is currently embarking on its "Reimagining" of the Bus System, which will allow more efficient and frequent service in many areas of the service area. This is in addition to its long-range planning work. You can find out more about METRO's initiatives here: <a href="http://www.ridemetro.org/METROVision/Default.aspx">http://www.ridemetro.org/METROVision/Default.aspx</a>. The City of Houston is also about to begin a Bikeway Master Plan process which will address issue such as connectivity, comfort, and safety. More details about the bike plan will be available soon.</p>
	<p>I strongly urge you NOT to build any roads so close to or through the Katy Prairie Preserve (Hwy 36 or Hwy 36A). I believe citizens of the Houston-Galveston area are faced with the ethical, even moral, question of whether we will attempt to preserve what is left of our natural areas, or cave in to economics and over-development to the point where we look like Los Angeles and have nothing wild left around us but grackles and squirrels! The KPP is one of the few relatively pristine areas in this part of Texas, and if we "build it, they will come." The KPP will become just another noisy, polluted, littered area of our counties surrounded by the usual boring big box stores, gas stations, billboards, and power lines you see everywhere.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comment. 36A is not part of the 2040 RTP. But to address your great point about environment, the RTP appendices include a Wetland Mitigation Paper (<a href="#">Appendix K</a>). The report outlines case studies and strategies on ways to mitigate some of the environmental impacts to wetlands caused by transportation facilities. Also, data from H-GAC's Eco-logical tool was included on the <a href="#">Corridor Summary Sheets</a> to provide a snapshot of the eco-types proposed projects may cross.</p>
	<p>The port connector routes of 36 and 36A are problematic from my standpoint.....the Katy Prairie is a unique habitat for migrating waterfowl which is being destroyed by the Grand Parkway and the expansion of Katy.....where does it stop? ever? Our children and grandchildren will regret our generations nonstop urban crawl. Go spend a morning watching 10,000 snow geese leave the limited roosts on the Prairie and you will understand.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. 36A is not part of the 2040 RTP.</p>
	<p>The 0.4% budget allocation for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is a step backwards, away from the momentum of desire and needs of the public, and woefully inadequate to meet the region's growing needs for a diversity of transportation solutions. The budget allocation should be raised to a minimum of 2%.</p>	<p>Thanks for commenting on the draft <i>2040 Regional Transportation Plan</i>!</p>



		<p>Based on feedback received from stakeholders throughout our region, H-GAC has also prepared a draft <i>2040 Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan</i>. That document can be reviewed at <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/go/pedbikeplan">www.h-gac.com/go/pedbikeplan</a>. Public comments can be submitted online through Friday, January 9.</p> <p>For more information on H-GAC's Pedestrian-Bicyclist Program, visit <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/go/pedbike">www.h-gac.com/go/pedbike</a>.</p>
	<p>In the RTP, the percentage of money allocated for bikes and pedestrians is way, way too low. I believe it to be about 1%. Livability requires walk-ability and bike-ability and we won't get any of that with only 1%. What's the point of taking mass transit if I can't walk or bike on either end of that trip! So, I advocate increasing the percentage of funding for bike and pedestrian infrastructure from 1% to at least 2%, but higher would be better! Regards, Colin Hendricks</p>	<p>Thanks for your comment. H-GAC just recently completed a draft of the Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan which sets a high-level vision and strategies for an improved, safer, and better connected bikeway network and pedestrian infrastructure in the region. You can find a draft of the plan here: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx</a>. I'll also forward your comment to staff working on the ped/bike plan.</p>
	<p>H-GAC reports that our region is expected to receive \$278,000,000.00 from Proposition 1 ONLY for roads. Other H-GAC budgets MUST increase BIKE-PED funding. The PEOPLE want 14% allocated for bike-ped. Too bad, the TPC is a bunch of white old men that only drive cars and don't represent the H-GAC region.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
	<p>Houston might benefit from a recent German invention: the auto tram. The "tram" has a capacity of 130+ people and is basically a "road train" that uses existing infrastructure (no rail lines need be built). See the website: <a href="http://www.autotram.info/en.html">http://www.autotram.info/en.html</a></p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
	<p>We need cities with their roads and bridges and pathways to be built for people, not for cars! H-GAC should be spending no less than 2% of their funding on transportation options that do NOT focus on cars getting through our city faster and making the city less livable for people.</p>	<p>H-GAC is aware of this and has completed several studies with local partners through its Livable Centers, Ped/Bike, and Subregional Planning programs to address more active modes of transportation. You can view some of the studies in the links below.</p> <p>Regional Ped/Bike Plan: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx</a></p> <p>Livable Centers: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/livablecenters/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/livablecenters/default.aspx</a></p>

		<p>Subregional Planning: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/taq/sub_regional/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/taq/sub_regional/default.aspx</a></p> <p>We have included additional language in the RTP text that discusses the need for multi-modal transportation options. In addition, a policy guide from the Regional Pedestrian – Bicycle Plan has been included in the RTP’s <u>Appendix F</u>.</p> <p>Let me know if you have additional questions or comments.</p>
	<p>Your comment box online is malfunctioning (<a href="http://www.h-gac.com/taq/plan/2040/comments.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/taq/plan/2040/comments.aspx</a>). I have alerted your webmaster of the issue. Please accept these comments by Air Alliance Houston on the 2040 RTP Air Quality Conformity determination. Letter from Air Alliance Houston (separate attachment)</p>	<p>Idling Ordinances: In late 2011, H-GAC’s Regional Air Quality Planning Advisory Committee (RAQPC) formed an Idling Reduction Subcommittee to develop a voluntary diesel idling reduction policy for public and private sector fleets operating in our nonattainment region. The subcommittee developed sample anti-idling policies and resources for private and public organizations. Information on this program is available at <a href="http://www.EngineOffHGAC.com">www.EngineOffHGAC.com</a>.</p> <p>Freight Movement: H-GAC is interested in working with regional entities to study and implement alternative routing for freight vehicles. These activities can have a positive impact on congestion and air quality. H-GAC completed a regional goods movement plan in 2013, which can be viewed here.</p> <p>Use of Federal and State Incentive Programs: H-GAC has aggressively pursued federal and state air quality funding (including TERP, LIRAP and DERA) which have been used to supplement and expand existing vehicle replacement programs. H-GAC is currently compiling information on these programs to inform local officials of opportunities available through these programs, and of the current legislative challenges.</p> <p>Outreach to Drayage Truck Owner-Operators: In 2009, H-GAC received a DERA grant for the development of a drayage truck loan program. To date, this program has assisted in the accelerated turnover of over 200 trucks, and over 80% of the participants in the program are small businesses/owner-operators. H-GAC staff and other organizations such as the Environmental Defense Fund and the Port of Houston Authority</p>

		<p>have partnered for targeted outreach events to owner-operators as well as additional DERA proposals for the accelerated replacement of heavy-duty drayage vehicles. H-GAC appreciates Air Alliance Houston's contribution to the improvement of the region's air quality, and we look forward to continued collaboration on future activities. If you have any questions regarding the information in this letter, please feel free to contact me at 713-499-6695 or Shelley.Whitworth@H-GAC.com</p>
	<p>I have read through this plan and think that overall, this plan shapes a realistic vision for where the region needs to go. I have a few comments regarding <i>Appendix F: 2040 Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan</i>. As a representative of the East Sunset Heights Association, I have heard numerous complaints regarding the need for safe streets for all users, including pedestrians and bicyclists. Too often, the City fails to ticket those who treat city streets as major thoroughfares (and drive upwards of 20mph above the designated 30 mph speed limit). Furthermore, I fear that the City and regional leaders are relying too heavily on regional bikeways to accomplish our bikeway infrastructure and not taking full advantage of the existing city street grid to accomplish this goal! Recent efforts, such as the Bayou Greenways Initiative, are important but do not solve all our regions' problems. While bicyclists are legally allowed to operate on certain City of Houston streets (and I assume this is the case elsewhere as well), they are certainly not encouraged to do so. Certainly one of the most cost-effective ways to improving the vibrancy of our region is to increase (and enforce!) laws that penalize automobile drivers who drive dangerously too close or too fast near bicyclists and pedestrians. Many strides have been made in recent years, but I believe this region can do better. It is time for the RTP to reframe the discussion on the street grid as a transportation grid and move away from a car-centric paradigm. This will help ensure that the Houston region continues to attract top talent from other areas around the world and is economically vibrant for decades to come.</p>	<p><i>Forwarded to Community and Environmental Planning Department to be included with Regional Pedestrian-Bicycle Plan comments.</i></p>
	<p>I would like to see and fully support investment in improvement to Houston's walkability and biking safety. The sidewalks in Montrose are very dangerous and completely unacceptable for anyone with mobility issues. There are so many establishment that will benefit from more pedestrian traffic.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments. I will forward them to staff coordinating the Regional Pedestrian-Bicycle Plan and to staff at the City of Houston. The Regional Pedestrian-Bicycle Plan completed to compliment the RTP, many of the concepts included in the ped/bike plan will be used to help inform future priorities.</p>

	<p>I live on the border between Montrose and Midtown and rejoice at its increasing density and walkability, but it is still an area where cycling is very hazardous due to traffic and street design. It is my understanding that HGAC is only planning to spend 0.4% on pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure and this will not be enough to meet our regions goals for a good quality of life, economic vitality, and increased safety and mobility. Your own survey shows that the general public would spend 14% on sidewalks and bikeways. Please increasing spending for these purposes to a minimum of 2%.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comment. As a compliment to the RTP, H-GAC completed the Regional Pedestrian – Bicycle Plan which provides an overarching vision and strategies for the region’s ped/bike infrastructure. A policy guide from the ped/bike plan is included in the Appendix F of the RTP. I will also forward your comment to the City of Houston as they are about to begin an update to their Bikeway Masterplan.</p>
	<p>I oppose the future addition of the Prairie Parkway to the RTP because it would fragment and negatively impact existing conservation lands on the Katy Prairie (Katy Prairie Conservancy). H-GAC should be considering the environmental consequences of any new roadways and give greater weight to protecting existing conservation lands as important quality of life assets.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Prairie Parkway is not included in the 2040 RTP. But to address your great point about environment, the RTP appendices include a Wetland Mitigation Paper (Appendix K). The report outlines case studies and strategies on ways to mitigate some of the environmental impacts to wetlands caused by transportation facilities. Also, data from H-GAC’s Eco-logical tool was included on the Corridor Summary Sheets to provide a snapshot of the eco-types proposed projects may cross.</p>
	<p>Please invest in the infrastructure of the city by building, extending, and widening bike lanes. Additionally, I would like to see bike lanes but in areas that are not as affluent as others. All people matter, not simply those inside the Inner Loop.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comment. As a compliment to the RTP, H-GAC completed the Regional Pedestrian – Bicycle Plan which provides an overarching vision and strategies for the region’s bike infrastructure. A policy guide from the ped/bike plan is included in the Appendix F of the RTP. We also updated the text in the RTP to include more language about the need to expand multi-modal transportation options.</p> <p>I will also forward your comment to the City of Houston as they are about to begin an update to their Bikeway Master Plan.</p>
	<p>We need cities with their roads and bridges and pathways to be built for people, not for cars! H-GAC should be spending no less than 2% of their funding on transportation options that do NOT focus on cars getting through our city faster and making the city less livable for people.</p>	<p>H-GAC is aware of this and has completed several studies with local partners through its Livable Centers, Ped/Bike, and Subregional Planning programs to address more active modes of transportation. You can view some of the studies in the links below.</p> <p>Regional Ped/Bike Plan: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx</a></p>

		<p>Livable Centers: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/livablecenters/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/livablecenters/default.aspx</a></p> <p>Subregional Planning: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/taq/sub_regional/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/taq/sub_regional/default.aspx</a></p> <p>We have included additional language in the RTP text that discusses the need for multi-modal transportation options. In addition, a policy guide from the Regional Pedestrian – Bicycle Plan has been included in the RTP’s Appendix F.</p>
	<p>The OST/South Union community in Houston has completed three surveys with 435 respondents specific to their neighborhood regarding pedestrians and biking and connecting to public transportation. Please include their data in future planning and discussion opportunities.</p>	<p><i>Forwarded to Community and Environmental Planning Department to be included with Regional Pedestrian-Bicycle Plan comments.</i></p>
	<p>I am opposed to adding the Prairie Parkway to the RTP because it will fragment and negatively impact existing Katy Prairie Conservancy lands. It is high time that H-GAC (past time!!) should give much greater weight to valuing and conserving regional green spaces. The green spaces should be considered as important regional and economic assets in themselves, especially considering future population growth, etc.</p> <p>2. I would really like to see a higher mode share for transit and bike/pedestrian planning. The region already has a vast roadway network (which may be difficult to maintain in future years). It is way past time that the region start to invest in real transportation alternatives that would give people real transportation alternatives. I would much rather take transit, ride my bike or walk to destinations, than have to drive. I detest driving on mega freeways, particularly when there is no separation of large trucks, and frequent accidents.</p> <p>3. There should be a higher mode share for bike/pedestrian projects in 2040 than just 1%. Many major cities have set significantly higher goals in this area. The goal for HGAC should be in the order of 10%. If other cities like Chicago, NYC, Washington, DC, LA, etc. can build genuine bike infrastructure such as protected bike lanes (cycle tracks), why can’t Houston. This region is FLAT—and there is little winter weather, so there is real potential for bike travel. (I am 63 and do many of my local trips by bike).</p> <p>4. This RTP should address climate change in a real and significant way. Many cities around the world have adopted transit projects and transportation planning that address energy conservation and climate change. These cities are planning significant transit expansions (London, Paris, Moscow, etc., etc.). HGAC should stop prioritizing road expansion and road networks. It is time go forward with transit and bike/pedestrian infrastructure in significant ways, so that people have some real options.</p>	<p>Mr. Blake Thank you for your comments. We look forward to responding to them in more detail. In the meantime, please consider the following responses.</p> <p>1. The 2040 RTP does not recommend construction of the Prairie Parkway. The Katy Prairie Conservancy has been working closely with H-GAC staff to ensure that all future study/consideration of the freight and hurricane evacuation needs along this corridor be closely linked up with their objectives and long-term goals for their prairie properties. With regard to the weighing of natural space, please consider the Eco-Logical tool, <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/environmental-stewardship/eco-logical/">http://www.h-gac.com/community/environmental-stewardship/eco-logical/</a>, which H-GAC created for this reason. It is available for use at the project-level.</p> <p>2. Thank you for your comment with regard to the transit share of regional travel options. We will incorporate it into the public record. Please note that there has been new language added to the 2040 RTP to integrate this consideration in general. See page 22 of the new draft in particular.</p> <p>3. We appreciate this comment. Thank you. While the percentage expenditure on bike/ped projects is not as high as you would like to see, although at almost \$800 million it is higher</p>

		<p>than previous plans, please refer to the <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx</a> for a more detailed aspiration for this important mode of transportation.</p> <p>4. Thank you for this comment on climate change. We agree could be a grave for future transportation options. We look forward to being as comprehensive as possible in future updates to the Regional Transportation Plan.</p>
	<p>At least 2% of transportation capital funds are needed for bicycle infrastructure in the Houston region. The first question asked for bicycle related projects is funding sources. That isn't the first question asked about other transportation options which often negatively impact existing cycling options (such as road widening that eliminates existing shoulders or intersection "improvements" that make it more dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We appreciate the important perspective of bicycle/pedestrian transportation users, and regret that any bias could be perceived through our eligibility criteria. Please note the recently completed Regional Ped/Bike plan for a more comprehensive vision of the future of this travel option <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx</a>. We look forward to responding to your comment in more detail.</p>
	<p>I find it disappointing and irresponsible that there is such a small amount being done to improve bicycle/pedestrian safety. I know many taxpayers who feel the same way. Safety first.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Regional Ped/Bike Plan was recently completed to compliment the RTP and may address some of your concerns. We hope that the document can provide a vision and strategies as to how the region can continue to become a more safe and connected place with multi-modal connections. A policy guide from the ped/bike plan has been included in the RTP's Appendix F.</p> <p>Let me know if you have additional questions or comments.</p>
	<p>We need more focus on public transportation opportunities, human-oriented design, and funding for infrastructure that encourages biking and walking.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments. H-GAC is aware of this and has completed several plans through its Livable Centers, Ped/Bike, and Subregional Planning programs to address more active modes of transportation and supportive development patterns. You can view some of the studies completed in the links below.</p> <p>Regional Ped/Bike Plan: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx</a></p>

		<p>Livable Centers: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/livablecenters/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/livablecenters/default.aspx</a></p> <p>Subregional Planning: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/taq/sub_regional/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/taq/sub_regional/default.aspx</a></p> <p>We have included in the RTP text language that discusses the need for additional transportation options.</p> <p>Let me know if you have any other questions.</p>
	<p>Reduce the dependence on vehicles for the area. Allow the smaller towns in the area to maintain their individuality and not get swallowed up by an engorged Houston. stop investing in larger freeways. start making biking lanes. continue and accelerate the construction of lite rail lines. Improve the bus system by making the stops less frequent. All of these steps will increase property values inside the loop and encourage development in central Houston, and discourage sprawling.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments. We have included language in the text to reflect the need and desire to create additional mobility alternatives. Let us know if you have any additional questions.</p>
	<p>We co-hosted an event last night, My Houston 2040, a monthly speaker series at Rudyards. At the event we provided copies of the draft 2040 RTP, encouraged people to go to the website and make public comments about what they want the 2040 RTP to do. These are the three comments that were submitted. I hope you will include them in the public comments on the draft 2049 Regional Transportation Plan: (1) "Allow me to commute by light rail and live in a complete neighborhood." (2) "Apply a transportation funding structure that matches voters' preferences." (3) "I would much rather ride rail down the street on which I live (Westheimer) than drive. or bike (safely). Houston will be fabulous if its livability changes as favorably between now and 2040 as it already has since I moved here for Grad School in 1976."</p>	<p>The comments included in this email will be included with the other comments on record. Thanks!</p>
	<p>The funding for bicycle and pedestrians is TOO LITTLE! We need at least 2%. How are we to create an engaging environment for our city when the majority of funding will be centered around the automobile.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comment. H-GAC recently completed its Pedestrian-Bicycle Plan which provides an overarching vision and strategies to create a safer and better connected regional system. You more information about the plan here: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/community/qualityplaces/pedbike/regional-pedestrian-and-bicycle-plan.aspx</a></p> <p>A funding and strategy guide completed as part of the Ped/Bike Plan was included in the RTP in Appendix F. <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/taq/plan/2040/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/taq/plan/2040/default.aspx</a>.</p>

	Please find attached letter from Director Rudick and Director Walsh (COH) for the Draft 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Let us know if you have any questions (attachment).	Response letter is on record and available upon request.
	It's apparent that a great deal of thought and effort has gone into the 2014 RTP. It also appears that the Northeast quadrant of Houston was largely overlooked with regards to thoroughfare improvements. This is unfortunate for those of us who live and work in the Lake Houston area. There is an enormous amount of growth occurring in the Lake Houston area including multiple residential communities and the 4,000 acre commercial development, Generation Park. At McCord Development, we would like to see more consideration for the Lake Houston area, including the North Lake Houston Parkway connection between the west and east sides of the lake. We feel these connections are critical for the future growth of the area	
	Need more money put toward bike and ped/trails and lanes for human powered transportation.	Forwarded to Community and Environmental Planning Department to be included with Regional Pedestrian-Bicycle Plan comments.
METRO	Comments Spreadsheet (separate attachment).	Draft was updated to reflect these comments.
Bike Houston	Separate letter (separate attachment).	Thank you for your comments. The Regional Ped/Bike Plan was completed to compliment the RTP. We hope that the document can provide a discernable vision and strategies as to how the region can continue to become a more safe and connected place with multi-modal connections. Language has been added to the RTP to reflect the sentiment that the region will need to be more multi-modal in the future and that additional implementation mechanisms may need to be examined.
Houston Sierra Club	These comments are supplemental to the comments I submitted to HGAC on December 17, 2014 on behalf of the Houston Regional Group of the Sierra Club. The RTP does not have a project listing like the last RTP I commented on about seven years ago. Where is the project listing and how is the public supposed to comment on an RTP when it does not know which projects are in the RTP and therefore cannot comment about the appropriateness of including certain transportation projects in the RTP? There does not appear to be a definition in the conformity determination for regional or project significant definitions. This means the public cannot understand the conformity determination fully and then comment on its appropriateness. The Sierra Club objects to these omissions of information	Mr. Mannchen Thank you for your comments in supplement to the letter you previously submitted. H-GAC is in the process of replying to your letter, and can address these comments in conjunction with that reply. There is a project listing associated with the 2040 RTP, you can download it at the following link: <a href="http://www.h-gac.com/taq/plan/2040/default.aspx">http://www.h-gac.com/taq/plan/2040/default.aspx</a> . It is titled "Draft 2040 RTP Project Listing". It was included with the original download materials. Sorry we did not communicate that effectively. We are looking into the issue with the missing section for "regional significance" in the AQ Conformity determination. Thank you for bringing it to our attention.



Houston Tomorrow	Letter submitted by Houston Tomorrow. Additional comments submitted from My Houston 2040 are on record.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a complimentary Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan completed along with the 2040 RTP. The Ped/Bike Plan provides an overarching vision and strategies for implementing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. The ped/bike plan also provides guidance on the types of ped/bike investments that should be prioritized in the region, as well as guidance on future investments.</li> <li>2. We are continually working to ensure that a balanced approach is presented in our planning efforts. The final draft will note the need for a continued multi-modal approach to our transportation needs</li> <li>3. This concept is included in the Regional Ped/Bike Plan.</li> <li>4. Understood. We are continuing work with stakeholders to identify transit priorities around the region.</li> <li>5. Many of our special studies such as Livable Centers and Subregional Planning have recommended projects and priorities to promote development patterns conducive for transit and alternative modes, as well as identify opportunities and strategies for infill development and mix of housing options.</li> <li>6. A wetlands mitigation paper is included in the Appendix K of the RTP that provides some guidance on how some environmental concerns can be mitigated. In addition, the ecological tool was used to provide information to project sponsors about the sensitivity of eco-systems along project corridors.</li> <li>7. See number 5.</li> <li>8. The Transportation Policy Council is comprised of locally-elected officials.</li> <li>9. The Healthy Planning Framework is included in Appendix H of the plan. This report provides case studies, metrics, and recommendations on how local and regional governments can better include healthy in planning decisions.</li> <li>10. See number 4.</li> <li>11. This comment has been made available to TXDOT.</li> <li>12. The 36A is not included in the 2040 RTP.</li> <li>13. The Federal Livability Principles were examined when</li> </ol>
------------------	---	---

		<p>the plan's goals and objectives were first being formed.</p> <p>14. Access is a critical component of the plan. The plan also includes an Environmental Justice analysis in Appendix B.</p> <p>15. The goals of the Our Great Region 2040 Plan were used to inform the formation of the goals of the 2040 RTP</p>
--	--	--