

## CIBOLO PARKWAY

CIBOLO, GUADALUPE COUNTY, TEXAS

Date: January 25, 2018

---

Project: Cibolo Parkway Environmental Review

---

To: Cibolo Turnpike L.P. | Scott Young

---

From: aci consulting | Kevin Ramberg

---

Subject: **Responses to Councilman Gibbs' Comments on Preliminary Draft Environmental Documents**

---

### **Introduction**

The following are responses and clarification provided at your request to Councilman Gibbs' comments received via email on January 23, 2018. The documents reviewed by Councilman Gibbs and on which the comments/feedback received included the following:

- Internal Review Draft Version of Cibolo Risk Assessment (Revision 1.4, dated Oct. 2017)
- Internal Review Draft Version of Logical Termini Memo (Revision 1.3, dated Oct. 2017)
- Internal Review Draft Version of Need and Purpose Tech Report (Revision 1.4, dated Oct. 2017)
- Internal Review Draft Version of Alternatives Tech Report (Revision 1.3, dated Oct. 2017)

The responses are organized by order of the comments/feedback received by Councilman Gibbs.

### **Comment / Responses:**

1. *The study is based on the roundabout at 1103 and Parkway interchange. This has recently changed to a flyover and will likely impact the study from both a noise and drainage perspective.*

**Response:** This is correct. The October 2017 Environmental Risk Assessment, which was the first review of the corridor with analysis of desktop resources (databases, aerials, maps, etc.), was based on the design at that time. The information from that document is incorporated into the technical reports and ultimately the Environmental Assessment. As the engineering design continues to change, the environmental analysis is changing as well.

2. *There is a lot of jargon and acronyms in the study. I think it would be helpful to have a workshop from an Engineer (not associated with Cibolo Parkway) to walk us through the study.*

**Response:** Thank you for the comment. As we have been progressing into the more detailed documents, we have been incorporating an acronym list immediately after the Table of Contents for ease of reference by general readers less familiar with the topics and information.

3. *On page 19, line 11 part 2. What constitutes a resource?*

**Response:** The Environmental Risk Assessment is a formatted TxDOT model document to help the preparers determine what resources warrant review and to what extent. For that reason, it functions more like an outline or checklist, is full of jargon, and spans any potential TxDOT project.

Page 19, line 11, part 2 pertains to the cumulative impacts review for the project. In the cumulative impacts assessment, all the resources reviewed for direct impacts are also potentially reviewed for a cumulative (i.e. additive) impacts. The resources that are reviewed for direct and indirect impacts (and potentially cumulative impacts) include the human environment (archeology, socioeconomic, displacements, noise, etc.), natural environment (wildlife, vegetation, endangered species, migratory birds, etc.) and the physical environment (wetlands, streams, groundwater, etc.).

4. *Several answers refer to alternate routes will require studies. Later in a separate document it became clear what the alternate routes were and why they were not included in the answers. This is a little confusing until you get the whole document read.*

**Response:** Agree and understand. As noted above, the Environmental Risk Assessment is a formatted TxDOT model document to help the preparers determine what resources warrant review and to what extent. For that reason, it functions more like an outline or checklist, is full of jargon, and spans any potential TxDOT project. Some TxDOT projects include potential alternatives that are carried through the NEPA environmental review. The Cibolo Parkway includes one build alternative (which follows the recommended corridor from the 2006 RJ Rivera Route Study) and one no build alternative.

5. *This is a desktop study so is a more in-depth study under way? (There is no way this study cost \$1M that Mr Crew stated.)*

**Response:** Yes, the Environmental Risk Assessment is Step 1. Step 2 consists of drafting Technical Reports (Purpose and Need, Alternatives, Biological Resources, Water Resources, Hazardous Materials, Cultural Resources, etc.). These Technical Reports are coordinated with respective resource agencies as required (i.e. the Cultural Resources Technical Report will be sent to the Texas Historical Commission for review, comment, and concurrence). Then in Step 3, the progress of these technical reports, comments and revisions are incorporated into the Environmental Assessment. Additionally, as noted about the roundabout earlier in the comments, the design is continually being optimized and refined during this time period, and the environmental documents are analyzing impacts based on the latest design.

6. *I would like to have a copy of the Needs and Purpose Memorandum if possible. This is a great background into why and a historical perspective and should not change although this is a draft document.*

**Response:** Based on comment #7 below, I believe Councilman Gibbs received and reviewed the internal review draft of the Need and Purpose Tech Report version from Oct. 2017.

*7. In the Needs and Purpose Memorandum on page 3 section 1.3 it refers to the bridge on 1103 crossing Lake Ray Hubbard. These types of typos will kill us in when this is made public.*

**Response:** Thank you for this comment. Understood. More care and attention will be made during the team review of internal review draft documents prior to approval for distribution to resource agencies or the general public.

*8. The Needs and Purpose Memorandum does not cover existing planned development on 78 and estimated growth below 78. This is critical to explain as future growth is one of the major impacts we are trying to resolve for the future.*

**Response:** Understood. The existing conditions and those reasonably foreseeable with or without the action (i.e. what will happen regardless of the build or no build alternatives) will be further explained in the environmental setting of the Environmental Assessment.

*9. On Page 10 of the Needs and Purpose Memorandum it discusses the current railroad crossings but does not mention the length of time it takes a train to cross nor does it mention the planned additional track which will likely indicate more rail traffic.*

**Response:** We are attempting to find more details on the time of crossings and the emergency response time currently with the at-grade crossing. The fact that an additional track is anticipated will also be included in the document and review.