

# **PUBLIC MEETING REPORT**

**October 28, 2014**

**LOOP 9**

**DALLAS AND ELLIS COUNTIES, TEXAS**

**CSJ: 2964-10-005**

**TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION**

**MARCH 2015**

## **CONTENTS**

- 1. PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS**
- 2. RESPONSE REPORT**
- 3. NEWSPAPER NOTIFICATIONS**
- 4. OTHER MEETING NOTIFICATION**
- 5. PUBLIC MEETING PHOTOS**
- 6. COPY OF SIGN-IN SHEETS**
- 7. COPY OF MEETING HANDOUTS**
- 8. COPY OF MEETING EXHIBITS**
- 9. COPY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS**
- 10. COPY OF MAILING LISTS**

## 1. PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

FOR: Loop 9  
LIMITS: From I-35E to I-45  
CSJ: 2964-10-005  
COUNTY: Dallas and Ellis

### Proposed Improvements

Loop 9 is a proposed new location roadway between I-35E and I-45. This segment was identified in the Loop 9 Corridor/Feasibility Study (completed March 2014) as the first section of Loop 9 to undergo engineering and environmental studies. The corridor is approximately 10 miles in length. As currently proposed, the project would consist of two one-way frontage roads within the ultimate proposed right-of-way. The ultimate proposed right-of-way width will accommodate a future 6-lane toll road.

### Need and Purpose

The intent of the Loop 9 project is to address population growth, transportation demand, system linkages and connectivity among the existing roadway facilities. I-20, the closest east-west freeway, lies miles to the north. Arterial streets like Bear Creek Road and Belt Line Road are growing more congested as the area adds residential, commercial, and industrial development. There are gaps in the arterial street network that force east-west traffic to take circuitous routes. Loop 9 would provide important east-west connectivity, reduce travel times, and support economic development opportunities in the study area.

### Notices and Articles

Notices were published in the following newspapers:

- *The Ellis County Press* on Sept. 25, 2014
- *The Suburbia News* on Sept. 25, 2014
- *The Dallas Morning News* on Sept. 28, 2014
- *Focus Daily News* on Sept. 28, 2014
- *Al Día* on September 28, 2014

Tearsheets and affidavits showing publication of the Loop 9 Public Meeting notices can be found in **Section 3**.

### Other Notification

In addition to newspaper notices, the project team distributed over 1,600 postcards advertising the Public Meeting to nearby landowners, elected officials, and other stakeholders within the project database.

Two email announcements regarding the Public Meeting were distributed to over 450 email addresses within the stakeholder database. The first email announcement was sent on Oct. 9,

2014. The second was sent on October 24, 2014 to remind recipients of the upcoming meeting. The mailing list is available in **Section 10**.

Copies of the Public Meeting legal notice and a map to the meeting location were mailed to all applicable local, state, and federal elected officials.

Information announcing the meeting date, location, and time was posted on the project website, [www.Loop9.org](http://www.Loop9.org).

Copies of the postcards, email announcements, mailouts, and screenshots of the website are included in **Section 4**.

### **Public Meeting Date and Location**

TxDOT held an open house Public Meeting with the purpose of presenting the Loop 9 project to the public and receiving comments. The meeting was held at Lancaster Elementary School (cafeteria) located at 1109 West Main Street, Lancaster, Texas on Tuesday, Oct. 28, 2014, from 4:30-7:00 p.m. See **Section 5** for photographs of the Public Meeting. Maps, drawings and other information about the project were displayed at the Public Meeting, showing the location of the study corridor, environmental constraints and impacts, and corridor alternatives. TxDOT staff and the project consultant team were available to answer questions. The maps and exhibits, as well as other Public Meeting materials (comment form, fact sheet, etc.) were posted on [www.Loop9.org](http://www.Loop9.org) on Oct. 28, 2014.

### **Attendance**

The total registered attendance at the Public Meeting was 210 people. A total of 12 TxDOT project staff, two representatives of the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), and 12 project consultants also attended.

Upon arrival, attendees were invited to sign in and given a project fact sheet and a comment form. Copies of the sign-in sheets are available in **Section 6**, and the handouts are available in **Section 7**.

### **Exhibits**

Public Meeting exhibits included ten informational boards; eight large-format schematic maps; and three maps showing environmental constraints. The boards described the project process, purpose and need, and information on project construction, phasing and funding. The schematic maps showed detailed proposed designs for each section of the corridor, and the constraints maps showed potential environmental impacts for each corridor alternative.

Two tables were set up at the Public Meeting for right-of-way and right-of-entry information. These tables, staffed by TxDOT and consultant team members, allowed attendees to learn more about potential impacts to adjacent property owners.

Public Meeting exhibits are available in **Section 8**.

## Summary of Comments from the Public

This is a summation of written comments received from the public. See **Section 2** for a Response Report including a listing of all comments received. Copies of the original written comments are included in **Section 9**.

Fifteen comment forms were submitted during the Oct. 28, 2014 Public Meeting. Following the meeting, one comment form, one letter and five emails were submitted during the official comment period, which ended on Nov. 7, 2014. A total of 22 comments were received at the Public Meeting and during the 10-day comment period.

Two comments stated support for the proposed project. Eight comments opposed the project and/or questioned the need for Loop 9. The remaining twelve comments expressed neither support nor opposition, but instead provided specific comments regarding some aspect of the project or the project process.

Four comments spoke directly to the project's Purpose and Need statement, arguing that the need for the project is fallacious. They stated other roads in the area were adequate for local transportation, the area is not developing fast enough to require Loop 9, and that the project would appropriate large amounts of rural land without providing added benefit to the community.

Three comments stated a preference for the preferred alignment, East 2; one comment expressed support for East 1 as it is a more direct route. One commenter was disappointed the alignment would no longer require acquisition of the commenter's property, while another comment praised the project team for proposing an adjusted alignment in order to accommodate homeowner concerns in the area. One comment discussed the lack of information presented on future extensions to the initial segment of Loop 9 (e.g. west of I-35E).

Four comments expressed opposition to Loop 9 as a toll road, or toll roads in general. One of these comments stated commuters and truckers would use other local farm-to-market (FM) roads if Loop 9 was constructed as a toll facility.

Seven comments discussed property rights of homeowners and landowners within the project area. Several comments expressed opposition to the idea of private property being appropriated or impacted by Loop 9; one comment thanked the project team for taking the concerns of local homeowners into account during the project design phase. One comment expressed dismay that the adjusted alignment would no longer require acquisition of the commenters' property, and instead would leave the property intact but next to a noisy road. Another comment asked whether TxDOT could prioritize acquisition of the commenter's property, as the highway plans make it difficult to either improve or sell the property.

One commenter suggested the Loop 9 project is motivated by the interests of the nearby Ferris Landfill; another commenter suggested the project is motivated by commercial interests to benefit the political elite.

Two comments spoke to the potential impacts of Loop 9. One comment referenced destruction of land and habitat, noise and light pollution, and impacts to quality of life. The other comment stated the East 2 alignment will help preserve important woodland and wetland habitat, and praised the project team for developing the adjusted alignment.

One comment noted the potential for increased truck traffic on local roads if Loop 9 is constructed in phases, and recommended truck restrictions during the initial phases of project development.

Seven comments referenced aspects of the public information process for Loop 9. Two comments stated the Loop9.org website does not include enough information, and is not kept current with the latest developments. Others stated public meetings were too few and far between, and did not provide opportunities for meaningful engagement. Several commenters felt the public meeting did not provide any new or definitive information on the proposed alignment or timelines for construction.

### **Summary of Comments/Issues That Were Addressed**

Regarding support/opposition and need for the proposed project: The need for the proposed Loop 9 project is to provide congestion relief for southern Dallas and northern Ellis Counties. The existing east-west arterial roadways do not provide adequate carrying capacity and there are no highways in the immediate vicinity. It is anticipated that traffic conditions will worsen as the area continues to grow in population and commercial/industrial development.

Central and northern Dallas County, as well as Collin County, contain a network of high-speed facilities and high-capacity arterial roadways which support the population growth in those areas. Although the cities in southern Dallas County and northern Ellis County are not increasing at the same rate as northern cities, the roadway network is not sufficient for the existing populations.

The studies done so far on the proposed Loop 9 facility have focused on reducing impacts to area residents. The current preferred alignment and right-of-way has reduced impacts in comparison to previous alternatives.

Regarding tolling: Due to large state transportation budget needs, tolling is always considered as a source of funding on large roadway projects. The Regional Transportation Council has a policy to evaluate all new limited-access capacity facilities for priced facility potential. The proposed Loop 9 project is included in *Mobility 2035: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas – 2013 Update*.

Regarding the proposed alignment options: TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final alignment is made. The proposed project is one segment of the overall proposed Loop 9 corridor, which spans between US 67 and I-20. Potential additional segments of Loop 9 (US 67 to I-35E and I-45 to I-20) will be evaluated through separate environmental studies.

Regarding concerns about property rights and impacts to homes: All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.

The adjusted alignment (East 2) was proposed in order to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat, drainage systems, and adjacent landowners. The modification was coordinated with local governments throughout the process.

Regarding the proposed project being politically motivated: While local cities, counties, and major stakeholders have been involved in the planning stages of the proposed project, the need for the project stems from increasing populations, congested roadways, and the lack of sufficient east-west corridors in southern Dallas and northern Ellis Counties. The proposed Loop 9 project is included in *Mobility 2035: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas – 2013 Update*.

Regarding concerns about impacts to the natural environment and quality of life: The proposed Loop 9 alignment has been modified in order to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat, drainage systems, and adjacent landowners. A noise analysis will be conducted during the environmental study process. If it is determined that a noise barrier is reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers. A meeting would be held with adjacent property owners to discuss the proposed noise barrier, if required.

Regarding the potential need for truck restrictions during the initial phases of Loop 9: TxDOT will evaluate the need for truck restrictions during the final design phases for the proposed project. This effort will be coordinated with local governments.

Regarding the public involvement process: The public involvement process for the Loop 9 project is following Texas state law, including the rules outlined in the Texas Administrative Code 43, Part 1, Chapter 2, Subchapter E, as well as TxDOT's rules for public involvement, as outlined in its Public Participation Environmental Handbook. Information provided throughout the public involvement process reflected the status of the study at the time the meetings were held. Project information items on [www.Loop9.org](http://www.Loop9.org) will now include a "posting date" in order to clarify when new information becomes available. TxDOT invites individuals or groups with questions about Loop 9 to contact the project team for further information. TxDOT Project Manager Bruce Nolley can be reached at [Bruce.Nolley@txdot.gov](mailto:Bruce.Nolley@txdot.gov) or 214-320-6100.

## 2. RESPONSE REPORT

This report presents the written comments and questions which were received by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) at the public meetings or in writing (via postal mail or email) as of November 7, 2014.

TxDOT held an open house/public meeting at the Lancaster Elementary School (cafeteria) located at 1109 West Main Street, Lancaster, TX 75146 on Tuesday, October 28, 2014, from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. All written comments have been reviewed. Due to the overlap and repetition in many comments, similar comments were consolidated and paraphrased to reduce duplication. As a result, the comments that appear in this report are often not the precise words found in the written comment. This has been done to reduce duplication of similar comments that elicited a common response and is in no way intended to obscure the substance of a comment.

Original comments are included in Table 1, following the comment/response overview. Responses are linked to each comment in the table via the letters assigned to each response below.

### **Comprehensive Comment/Response Overview**

**A. Comments(s)** - Two citizens stated they support the proposed project and/or preferred alternative. Eight comments opposed the project and/or questioned the need for Loop 9. Four comments spoke directly to the project's Purpose and Need statement, stating the need for the project is not accurate.

**A. Response** - The need for the proposed Loop 9 project is to provide congestion relief for southern Dallas and northern Ellis Counties. The existing east-west arterial roadways do not provide adequate carrying capacity and there are no highways in the immediate vicinity. It is anticipated that traffic conditions will worsen as the area continues to grow in population and commercial/industrial development.

Central and northern Dallas County, as well as Collin County, contain a network of high-speed facilities and high-capacity arterial roadways which support the population growth in those areas. Although the cities in southern Dallas County and northern Ellis County are not increasing at the same rate as northern cities, the roadway network is not sufficient for the existing populations.

The studies done so far on the proposed Loop 9 facility have focused on reducing impacts to area residents. The current preferred alignment and right-of-way has reduced impacts in comparison to previous alternatives.

**B. Comment(s)** - Four comments expressed opposition to Loop 9 as a toll road, or toll roads in general. One of these comments stated commuters and truckers would use other local farm-to-market (FM) roads if Loop 9 was constructed as a toll facility.

**B. Response** - Due to large state transportation budget needs, tolling is always considered as a source of funding on large roadway projects. The Regional Transportation Council has a policy to evaluate all new limited-access capacity facilities for priced facility potential. The proposed Loop 9 project is included in *Mobility 2035: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas – 2013 Update*.

**C. Comment(s)** - Three comments stated a preference for the preferred alignment, East 2; one comment expressed support for East 1 as it is a more direct route. One commenter was disappointed the alignment would no longer require acquisition of the commenter's property, while another comment praised the project team for proposing an adjusted alignment in order to accommodate homeowner concerns in the area. One comment discussed the lack of information presented on future extensions to the initial segment of Loop 9 (e.g. west of I-35E).

**C. Response** - TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final alignment is made. The proposed project is one segment of the overall proposed Loop 9 corridor, which spans between US 67 and I-20. Potential additional segments of Loop 9 (US 67 to IH 35E and IH 45 to IH 20) will be evaluated through separate environmental studies.

**D. Comment(s)** - Seven comments discussed property rights of homeowners and landowners within the project area. Several comments expressed opposition to the idea of private property being appropriated or impacted by Loop 9; one comment thanked the project team for taking the concerns of local homeowners into account during the project design phase. One comment expressed dismay that the adjusted alignment would no longer require acquisition of the commenters' property, and instead would leave the property intact but next to a noisy road. Another comment asked whether TxDOT could prioritize acquisition of the commenter's property, as the highway plans make it difficult to either improve or sell the property.

**D. Response** - All right-of-way acquisitions would be performed according to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. When acquiring right-of-way, TxDOT compensation is determined based on an independent appraiser and fair market value. Relocation assistance could also be provided. Discussions with property owners concerning the acquisition of their property will not occur until after the environmental document and preliminary schematic are approved and the right-of-way maps have been prepared.

The adjusted alignment (East 2) was proposed in order to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat, drainage systems, and adjacent landowners. The modification was coordinated with local governments throughout the process.

**E. Comment** - One commenter suggested the Loop 9 project is motivated by the interests of the nearby Ferris Landfill; another commenter suggested the project is motivated by commercial interests to benefit the political elite.

**E. Response** - While local cities, counties, and major stakeholders have been involved in the planning stages of the proposed project, the need for the project stems from increasing populations, congested roadways, and the lack of sufficient east-west corridors in southern Dallas and northern Ellis Counties. The proposed Loop 9 project is included in *Mobility 2035: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas – 2013 Update*.

**F. Comment** - One comment discussed meetings and collaboration on the proposed Loop 9 alignment alternatives between the cities of Red Oak and Lancaster, and Dallas and Ellis Counties. They suggested the continuation of Loop 9 along the county line between Houston School Road and Highway 342 (which crosses the commenters' property) warrants a second look by TxDOT.

**F. Response** - TxDOT appreciates your feedback related to the specific corridors and sections, and will analyze all comments provided before a determination on the final alignment is made.

**G. Comment(s)** - Two comments spoke to the potential impacts of Loop 9. One comment referenced destruction of land and habitat, noise and light pollution, and impacts to quality of life particularly within the Cedar Hill community. The other comment stated the East 2 alignment will help preserve important woodland and wetland habitat, and praised the project team for developing the adjusted alignment.

**G. Response** - The proposed Loop 9 alignment has been modified in order to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat, drainage systems, and adjacent landowners. A noise analysis will be conducted during the environmental study process. If it is determined that a noise barrier is reasonable (providing a 5 decibel decrease for 50% of the impacted noise receivers and a 7 decibel decrease for at least one noise receiver) and feasible (a cost of no more than \$25,000 per receiver), a noise barrier would be proposed as abatement for impacted noise receivers. A meeting would be held with adjacent property owners to discuss the proposed noise barrier, if required.

**H. Comment** - One comment noted the potential for increased truck traffic on local roads if Loop 9 is constructed in phases, and recommended truck restrictions during the initial phases of project development.

**H. Response** - TxDOT will evaluate the need for truck restrictions during the final design phases for the proposed project. This effort will be coordinated with local governments.

**I. Comment(s)** - Seven comments referenced aspects of the public information process for Loop 9. Two comments stated the Loop9.org website does not include enough information, and is not kept current with the latest developments. Others stated public meetings were too few and far between, and did not provide opportunities for meaningful engagement. Several commenters felt the public meeting did not provide any new or definitive information on the proposed alignment or timelines for construction.

**I. Response** - The public involvement process for the Loop 9 project is following Texas state law, including the rules outlined in the Texas Administrative Code 43, Part 1, Chapter 2, Subchapter E, as well as TxDOT's rules for public involvement, as outlined in its Public Participation Environmental Handbook. Information provided throughout the public involvement process reflected the status of the study at the time the meetings were held. Project information items on [www.Loop9.org](http://www.Loop9.org) will now include a "posting date" in order to clarify when new information becomes available. TxDOT invites individuals or groups with questions about Loop 9 to contact the project team for further information. TxDOT Project Manager Bruce Nolley can be reached at [Bruce.Nolley@txdot.gov](mailto:Bruce.Nolley@txdot.gov) or (214) 320-6100.

**Table 1: Public Comments Received**

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>My husband, [REDACTED], and I live at [REDACTED] Drive, Lancaster, TX. We live outside the city limits off of Ferris Road. We moved there a little over 11 years ago. For most of those years, we have been hearing about this Loop 9 that was coming through. We even had our land surveyed by your representatives several years ago. At first we were not happy about the fact that the road was proposed to go right through our property. However, over the last several years, property owners around us (anticipating the new loop) have decided not to take care of their property. We have cared for and maintained our home and 5 acres, but the area around us continues to decline. We also have to contend with the ever-growing landfill looming in our immediate horizon to the southeast of us. We had begun to look forward to being bought out because of these factors. I looked at the Loop 9 website several months ago and saw that the road course was changed to be just north of us but was hopeful that we would still be in its path. However, we were informed at the most recent public meeting (in Lancaster) by one of the TxDOT representatives that this was not the case. My husband and I are very upset about this. It looks like at this point, our property will soon be between a noisy toll road and the ugly eyesore of the Ferris Landfill. We are very suspicious at this point that the owners of the landfill had something to do with this. Needless to say, this Loop 9 that has been in the works for years will negatively impact our property values. My husband and I protest the change in plans to move this particular section of the toll road farther north at the probable suggestion and lobbying of the landfill owners.</p>	C, D, E
2	<p>Not fair, go somewhere else, bullies. I pray for your failure.</p>	A
3	<p>I appreciate the time you took to talk to me last night at Lancaster Elementary School about the Loop9 project. I am sending a description of our property to give you an idea of the area we were talking about. Our ranch is on 100 acres on the south side of [REDACTED] Rd., one mile west of I-45. We have had this property about 13 years and have made a lot of improvements, including a complete perimeter fence of 4' tall, 4"X 4" mesh 16' hog panels that keep animals in and predators out. We also did extensive cross fencing and improvements to the land and facilities.</p> <p>When the Loop9 project was announced several years ago and was presented to us as something that would happen soon, we discontinued making improvements to the property. We have been in limbo for about 7 years. We want to sell the property at this time and move away from the area, but will have a hard time finding buyers when we disclose the plans for a highway to go through the middle of our property at some time in the future. This also leaves the back 1/3 of the property landlocked by Ten Mile Creek. Yesterday you offered to send the description of our property to [REDACTED] in "right of way" to see if the purchase of the property could be prioritized so we can move forward. We use this property for our ranching operation and will not be able to buy a new ranch until this property is sold. I really appreciate any help or advice you can give us. If you have any questions or need any other information, please let me know. Thank you again for your help.</p>	D

4	<p>It was a pleasure meeting you last Tuesday at the Loop 9 public meeting in Lancaster. We wanted to thank you again for your and the design consultants consideration during the planning stages. We are happy that the exit ramp on West Reindeer Road was omitted in front of our home and our large live oaks will be spared. You may remember our neighbor and friend, [REDACTED]. The maps used on the road design were before 2009 and didn't show his family's beautiful 6,000 sq. ft. Home at [REDACTED] Road. We are hoping to appeal to the designers for a minor shift in the road design to help them not have the road so close to their front door. Besides their children's safety concerns, they do receive income from producing 16 calves and 20 goats a year. The market price of feeder calves are \$1,300 to \$1,500 a head and goats are \$150. The 8-10 acres that would be taken by the road is a pasture that they just spent \$6,000 improving by having Tifton grass sprigged. The video attached shows their home and some of the remodeled outbuildings he has so meticulously crafted. Our other neighbors [REDACTED] to the west of us at [REDACTED] Road, are in the same situation, and as tight-knit neighbors, we hope to see a slight northern shift for them as well. They are a young couple and are building their lives and horse boarding business. They have a four year old and hope to have more children, and the road that close to them is a real concern with little ones. We appreciate that someone is listening and wants to help us ease into the transition from an isolated spot of rural community living, into the future of Dallas County, with a situation that we can all satisfactorily and safely live with.</p>	C, D
5	<p>I find the "required need" argument fallacious and specious at best. What circuitous routes? No real need has been demonstrated adequately to rape and pillage crop-producing areas with potentially hazardous material from commercial trucking accidents into Ten Mile and Bear Creeks. This is NOT a project to benefit citizens, but to eradicate populations in the vicinity in favor of deep commercial projects to benefit state coffers and the political elite.</p>	A, D
6	<p>The project needs to be presented with more consistent information. The website Loop9.org is not kept current. It would be helpful to have timetables. I came in to this meeting and from when I started around the room I heard three different timetables from staff with TxDOT badges. When these public meetings are presented, they need to be consistent. This is why people get frustrated with government projects.</p>	I
7	<p>As Cedar Hill residents and homeowners, we are against the development of Loop 9 in general and especially through the City of Cedar Hill. A highway of this size will change the face and topography of Cedar Hill in a negative and detrimental way. We have 287 and I-20 currently in place and it doesn't take much longer to access them. The amount of environmental impact including destruction of land and habitat, noise and light pollution, and quality of life is too high a price to pay for a highway like Loop 9. Right now, we are homeowners and taxpayers in Cedar Hill, but the permanency of those statuses depends quite a bit on the outcome of this project. Again, we are against development of the Loop 9 project.</p>	A, D, G
8	<p>Hola mi nombre es [REDACTED], soy esposa de [REDACTED]. Quisiera saber la gravedad del Loop 9 que tendra en nuestra calle [REDACTED], Red Oak, TX 75154 ya para nuestra comunidad. Por favor quisiera que nos entienden nuestra preocupacion. Gracias.  <i>English translation:</i> Hello my name is [REDACTED], wife of [REDACTED]. We would like to know the impact Loop 9 will have on our street [REDACTED], Red Oak, TX 75154 and on our community. Please understand we have concerns. Thank you.</p>	I
9	<p>It was mentioned in the recent Public Meeting held in Lancaster that the project may be constructed in stages; i.e., portions of the proposed phased frontage road would be built in sections, between major intersections. This new route could potentially bring additional truck traffic that would end up on local roads thereby increasing loading demands on existing streets and introducing safety concerns for everyday users. The City is expressing concerns over this probable scenario and would like for TxDOT to look into the possibility of restricting trucks during the initial phases.</p>	H

10	It would probably be much cheaper and simpler to go with proposal 1 due to the less curving and winding of the road. Also, scrap the idea of making it a toll road because commuters and truckers will go back to using the FM roads if they are forced to pay a toll. An extra 10 cents per gallon on gas would go a long way in securing proposal 1 funding.	B, C
11	The preferred alignment, East 2, will preserve an extensive drainage system, woodland and wetland that serve as year-round wildlife habitat. Despite repeated inputs from well-informed professionals about the future worth of the property, our firm plan is to enter all of our reunified parcels (~43 acres) into a conservation easement to protect the natural space for eternity. Representatives from the Texas Forest Service (██████, Temple) and the National Prairies Association of Texas (██████, Austin) have both walked and surveyed the land and strongly advocate our plan, which is in progress currently. A jewel will be preserved for the City of Lancaster and County of Dallas, along with the shifted right-of-way for the facility. Sincere thanks to all.	C, G
12	No information was presented for the potential Loop 9 through Ellis County west of I-35. Again, this appears to be setting the anchor for an extension through Ellis County west of I-35 with no information showing proposed expansion of 664 and pending public hearing for a Wal Mart on the northeast corner of Hampton Road. We don't want toll roads when we are paying for something we don't want - the Loop 9 and 664 expansion and then paying a potential toll to drive in and on the streets we traverse in our neighborhoods and have already paid for in taxes!	A, B, C, I
13	"If you live or drive in southern Dallas County or northern Ellis County, you know that traveling through the area can still be a challenge. I-20, the closest east-west freeway, lies miles to the north. Arterial streets like Bear Creek Road and Belt Line Road are growing more congested as the area adds residential, commercial, and industrial development. More people living, shopping and working in the area means more vehicles on the roads. Heavy truck traffic from the Inland Port inter-modal freight facility near I-45 coupled with ongoing international freight movement may put even more pressure on the local transportation system." Do you think by saying nonsense like this, we will eventually believe it? There's no more traffic on these roads than there was 8 years ago when we moved here. Who are you kidding. Fix the crappy roads in Dallas & leave us alone!	A
14	I'm in favor of the preferred alternative as of 10/28/14.	A, C
15	We would like facts. It is like every meeting we come to, you'll tell us the same thing. I feel like you are just wasting our time. We want to remodel our house and I do not know what to do.	I
16	Please attempt to make improvements in informing the public, and more importantly, property owners, as to right-of-way and property acquisition timelines and processes. While I appreciate the Loop9.org website and its contents, it is only informative on a limited basis with either outdated information or very generalized information. People in southern Dallas County and in Ellis County want to know exactly what's happening with this road, as it's happening in its entirety as a project. Public meetings are too infrequent to provide enough of this level of detail. People want to know when and how the road will be built, and when right-of-way property acquisition will start taking place... throughout this whole project. We've all been living with this a long time and would appreciate more forthcoming answers and information on a regular basis.	I

17	<p>We wanted to pass along our comments relative to the recent public meeting regarding shifts in the alignment of Loop 9 between Houston School Road and Highway 342. As you know, two possible alignments impacting our property have both been under consideration for a considerable period of time. At the recent meeting, I was told that the cities of Red Oak, Lancaster, and Dallas and Ellis Counties had met and preferred the southernmost route along this portion of the corridor. Specifically that the City of Red Oak had strong interest in the southern most route including improving Houston School Road from Ovilla Road to the Loop 9 intersection. In light of this new interest by Red Oak and Ellis County, and with what appears to be the collaboration of Lancaster and Dallas County, we believe that the continuation of Loop 9 along the Dallas County and Ellis County line from Houston School Road to Highway 342 (at least the portion of this route that crosses our property) warrants a second look by TXDOT. We are happy to discuss this with you in more detail.</p>	C, F
18	<p>Please move forward now that you seem to have a good plan developed. The wait-and-see direction has been difficult for people to move forward.</p>	A, I
19	<p>I do not approve of the Loop 9!</p>	A
20	<p>I fail to see the need for this project. I-20 is only a few miles away and provides adequate east-west transport between I-35 and I-45. Other east-west roads are adequate - the area is not growing as fast as Collin and Kaufman Counties. This project will simply appropriate large amounts of rural land for the purpose of collective tolls for the state. Many homeowners and farmers will be displaced for no good reason. Your stated "project needs and purpose" are entirely fallacious - I will urge my state representative to oppose this project.</p>	A, B, D
21	<p>I am very much against this project. Texas "does not" need another toll road. My rights as a property owner in this state will be completely ignored and my home of 35 years will be taken from me - "stolen legally" in fact. I have spoken to homeowners that TxDOT has "promised to make whole"; they in fact were not. If I say my property is not for sale, especially for the price you will offer, you will take it anyway. In my eyes that's organized crime. As I mentioned before, Texas does not need another toll road. There are too many already. This project will disrupt my and my family's lives. I truly wish TxDOT respected property owners' rights.</p>	A, B, D
22	<p>Some benefits may accrue to Lancaster residents, but this may be a boondoggle as the Super Collider was to lower Dallas County, north Ellis County, and Kaufman County. The exact route and disclosure would be beneficial to know to close residents thereof.</p>	I