

**Appendix 16**  
**Public Comment Process**

## HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL

### Public Comment period/Public Meeting

H-GAC is announcing the opening of a 30-day public comment period to give the public an opportunity to review the following:

- Modifications to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and conformity to reflect a project scope clarification on one segment of US 290. The project will widen US 290 from 8 to 12 main lanes from West of Pinemont Drive to West of 34th Street and is currently scheduled in the short-range component of the 2035 RTP. This project is not programmed in the current 2008-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Proposed TIP Amendment #186 advances a \$7.5 million project (FM 524 at the Phillips refinery) from the short range component of the 2035 RTP into the 2008-2011 TIP using local funds. The project will relocate approximately 2 miles of FM 524 terminating at an intersection with SH 35 east of the Phillips refinery. This action does not require modification to the regional air quality conformity analysis.

H-GAC will host a public meeting on the items shown above on January 6, 2010, from 5:30-7:00 p.m. at the H-GAC offices, 3555 Timmons Lane, 2nd Floor Conference Room A. The public is encouraged to attend and provide comments to H-GAC. Submit all written comments to Transportation Public Information, Houston-Galveston Area Council, P.O. Box 22777, Houston, Texas 77227-2777, email to [publiccomments@h-gac.com](mailto:publiccomments@h-gac.com), or fax to (713) 993-4508.

The public comment period began on December 21, 2009 and will end on January 25, 2010 at 5:00 pm.

#### Documents

- [TIP Amendment No. 186](#)

#### Conformity Determination:

- [2009 Conformity documents](#)

All files listed in this section require [Adobe Reader](#) unless noted otherwise.

**Following are the TCEQ comments with our H-GAC answers in red (received on 1/21/10):**

Exec summary, milestones,

- You mention the November 13, 2009 conformity. Because the November 13, 2009, FHWA conformity approval was conditional, I suggest you mention this and document how the SH105 issue was addressed.
- Few sentences were added to the main document to explain the conditional approval and how it was solved.
- 
- The correct title of the SIP is *The Houston-Galveston-Brazoria Nonattainment Area Reasonable Further Progress SIP*.
- The correct title for the SIP was added to the document as Revisions to of the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria 1997 Eight-Hour Nonattainment Area Reasonable Further Progress State Implementation Plan
- 
- The budgets were effective June 22, 2009
- That date was added to the main document
- 
- You say the new TIP and RTP are scheduled for consideration in January. Shouldn't this say the *amended* TIP, RTP and associated conformity determination will be considered?
- The document was changed

#### Table 7 link based emissions

- Emissions for 2009 on table 7 appear to be before post process adjustments. However for 2019, 2025, and 2035 appear to be after adjustments. Please explain or reconcile Table 7 and Table 8.
- The error was corrected

#### 2019 analysis year emissions versus 2018 proposed attainment demonstration budgets

- Emissions from analysis year 2019 are higher than the 2018 newly proposed attainment demonstration budgets (proposed but not yet adopted). Because you'd normally expect to see lower emissions in future years and because VMEP credit does not appear to completely explain the difference, can you provide the temperature-humidity adjustment that was used in this conformity analysis versus the adjustment used for the proposed attainment demonstration SIP?
- The discrepancy is not due to the temperature-humidity adjustment. It is due to the fact that the 2018 network is already 2 years old and it has a very different VMT and VHT.

#### MOBILE parameters

- The Web site is missing the MOBILE appendices. TCEQ cannot complete its review until these are provided.
- Appendix 8 is the one that has the MOBILE6 input parameters. Originally it was believed that did not need to be updated, but it turns out that we have updated the registration distribution and the diesel fractions in the modeling (please refer to the checklist, Appendix 17). After realizing this, H-GAC posted a new Appendix 8.

## Misc

- The table of contents has some error symbols, and it ends up not being useful because there are no page numbers in the document.
  - This problem was corrected
  - 
  - First paragraph under executive summary does not make sense – needs some editing.
  - We welcome suggestions 😊
- Multiple appendices are missing from the Web page
  - As it was agreed on the last conference call only the appendices that were updated are being posted on the web, otherwise the committee needed to refer to the old appendices in the previous conformity. Anyway, not to create confusion H-GAC agreed on posting all the new and old appendices together.

## Appendix 13 TCMs

- Appendix 13 covers additional projects, i.e., projects that are not applicable TCMs. It makes it difficult for reviewers and public to match up the SIP with your demonstration of timely implementation.
  - The project categorization scheme used in the approved MTP (H-GAC 2035 RTP) differs from that in the previous MTP (H-GAC 2025 RTP) which was in effect when the TCMs were identified for the applicable SIP. Previous versions of the Appendix have included both categories (see Appendix 13 from August 2009 Conformity), but comments were received that this was confusing and difficult for the public to follow. H-GAC staff will work with TCEQ to resolve this issue in a timely manner.
- The SIP's TCM substitution Project ID 13200 that was enacted in spring 2006 is not indicated in the demonstration of timely implementation, appendix 13 (same comment as last time). However, appendix 13 reports on ID 13202, which appears to be the applicable project. Please make sure the public can find the substitution enacted by the TCEQ in appendix 13, namely "Proj ID13200."
  - The correct project reference number is 13202. A notation will be added to the Appendix to clarify.
- The SIP's TCM substitution has a category called ITS. Suggest you add the acronym to appendix 13 to help the public match up the SIP with your appendix , i.e., Category: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

- Relates to first comment. Will be addressed at the same time. ('ITS' was a category in the 2025 RTP, but it is not a stand-alone category in the 2035 RTP)
- The SIP's TCM substitution has a category called P&R. Suggest you add this acronym to appendix 13 to help the public match up the SIP with your appendix, i.e., Category: Park and Ride (P&R)
  - Relates to first comment. Will be addressed at the same time. ('P&R' was a category in the 2025 RTP, but it is not a stand-alone category in the 2035 RTP)
- The SIP's TCM substitution has a category called TSM. Suggest you clarify in appendix 13 where these projects are found, i.e., in one instance a TSM project is listed under: Category: Turn Lanes, in another instance a SIP TSM project is listed in appendix 13 under Category: Intersection Improvement.
  - Relates to first comment. Will be addressed at the same time. ('TSM' was a category in the 2025 RTP, but it is not a stand-alone category in the 2035 RTP)

**TCEQ comments received on 1/13/10**

All,

TCEQ has the following comments on **rtp35-link list-December 2009.xls**

Thanks and let me know if you have questions.

Margie

**US290** - please explain why MPOID 11573 links 23680-6316 and 6315-6316 are 6 lanes in 2009, yet the other links under this ID are 8 lanes in 2009, and how they are accounted for in the model.

US 290: MPOID 11573 covers 34<sup>th</sup> to Pinemont. The portion from 34<sup>th</sup> to 43<sup>rd</sup> is currently 8 lanes. The portion from 43<sup>rd</sup> to Pinemont is 6 lanes. This is how it is currently represented in the model and will all be increased to 12 lanes by 2019.

- 
- **Bay Area Blvd** -- please explain why certain links indicate 5 lanes in 2019 but 4 lanes in 2009, 2025, and 2035 and how they are accounted for in the model.
- 4 links had 3 value in the b\_lanes field instead of a 2 for 2019, which totaled to 5 lanes instead of 4. The error was corrected in the model.

- 
- **Clinton Drive** links do not have an MPOID. Are any of these links related to the Clinton Drive improvement project under ARRA funds? If not is this project accounted for in this revision?
  - Consist of 2 TIP projects MPOID 11179 (reconstruction) and MPOID 14667 (rehab) which are both REHAB projects that do not add additional lanes.
  - Rehab projects are not coded into the model unless there is an increase in lanes.
- 
- **IH610 EB FR**-- please explain why certain links indicate 2 lanes in 2009, 2025, and 2035 and 5 lanes in 2019, and how they are accounted for in the model.
  - 3 links had 3 value in the b\_lanes field instead of a 0 for 2019, which totaled to 5 lanes instead of 2. The error was corrected in the model.
- 
- **Mount Houston** -- please explain why certain links indicate 2 lanes in 2009, 2025, and 2035, yet indicate 4 lanes in 2019, and how they are accounted for in the model.
  - : 4 links had 3 value in the b\_lanes field instead of a 2 for 2019, which totaled to 5 lanes instead of 4. The error was corrected in the model.
- 

).

**Below are the comments from the Public Meeting for the conformity finding on January 6, 2010**

Conformity Finding to RTP and TIP - Public Meeting

January 6, 2010

3555 Timmons Lane, Suite 120

Second Floor Conference Room A

Graciela Lubertino

- There were no public comments