



# Comment Response Matrix

## SH 361 Feasibility Study

---

CSJ 0180-10-080

Comments submitted for Public Meeting held  
March 1, 2021

Committer Number	Committer Name	Date Received	Source	Comment Topic	Response
1	Jackson Hurst	3/2/2021	Email	The concept that I support for the SH 361 Feasibility Study is Concept E. The reason I support Concept E is Concept E will clarify frontage road movements and will clarify lane movements in the SH 361/SH 35 Interchange.	Thank you for your comment. We will be sure to include it in the virtual public meeting record.
2	Julio Salinas	3/15/2021	Email	<p>Very nice presentation.</p> <p>Thank you for investing the time and effort to help our local community with our traffic congestion issues.</p> <p>Overall the "Concept E - SPUI" proposed to revise the SH361 design is NOT adequate and should NOT move forward until more basic issues are investigated and understood. "Concept E - SPUI" is basically the same traffic flow as what is currently existing and will not improve the situation other than eliminating the train interaction, which is minimal.</p> <p>"Concept E - SPUI" proposal does not alleviate or add capacity to any of the main sources of congestion that occur as a result in bottleneck and backed up traffic from Large facilities and larger than normal construction personal, in the area, all with similar schedules (Kiewit, Cheniere, OXY, Chemours, MODA, GCJV, Nashtech, IISD, Etc.)</p> <p>Most significant current issues are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Morning (Rush) ~6-7am (Bulk of Traffic Exiting from North Bound SH35/181 to East Bound SH361)</li> <li>2. Evening (Rush) ~5-6pm (West Bound SH361 back to South Bound SH35/181)</li> <li>3. Minor flows of Crossing traffic in the mix with these (Rush) major flows are extremely delayed and dangerous.</li> <li>4. Train crossing issues can be resolved with minimal impact by closing those crossings and diverting traffic to the existing overpass.</li> </ol> <p>What days and times are the highest frequency of accidents in this area? I'd bet most are in the Rush times and flows as described above.</p> <p>If there were a way to give the major traffic flows (Rush), described above, a dedicated/unobstructed route, this would relieve 99% of all the bottlenecks, congestion, and dangerous crossing traffic.</p> <p>Priorities Notes</p> <p>TxDOT is spread too thin already.</p> <p>There is more benefit in the completion of the following projects in progress:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project ID 010104112, (GCJV Exit, Highway US 181)</li> <li>2. Project ID 354001001, (Kiewit/Ingleside Bypass, Highway SH 200)</li> <li>3. Project ID 010106095, (New Harbor Bridge, Highway US 181)</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We will note that you do not support Concept E.</p> <p>The Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) option was developed to meet the expected future traffic demand at the interchange. We will take your comments and information regarding morning and evening rush and use these to validate our traffic model. In other words, we want to make sure our traffic model accurately reflects the current conditions so the impact of proposed improvements on traffic can be effectively evaluated.</p> <p>As is included in your comment, the existing configuration does not meet the current traffic demands. As traffic increases the situation is expected to worsen. The proposed SPUI provides for increased capacity, efficiency, and safety for the traveling public. As noted in the presentation, the SPUI requires only one traffic signal and thus minimizes delay compared to a typical diamond interchange.</p> <p>In regard to the crash frequency inquiry, we analyzed four years of crash data (2016-2020) and discovered the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total of 80 crashes over the four-year period</li> <li>• Most crashes occurred on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays.</li> <li>• 74% of the crashes occurred during daylight hours.</li> <li>• More crashes occurred between 5:00 and 6:00 pm, with 6:00 to 7:00 pm being the second highest hour.</li> </ul> <p>a majority of these are happening during the PM peak hours, with most of them involving rear-end collisions.</p> <p>The SPUI option, along with the additional improvements to the weaving and merging areas, are expected to improve safety thereby reducing the frequency of crashes. The currently proposed design does not preclude construction of certain direct connectors at a future date.</p> <p>Thank you for your input regarding areas of concern and priority projects.</p>

Commenter Number	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment Topic	Response
3	Theresa Finch	3/15/2021	Mail In	<p>I greatly appreciate this online version of a public meeting. Very well done. I drive the area from Ingleside to Corpus Christi every week day during peak morning and evening rush hours due to my travel for work in Corpus Christi. Currently traffic issues are dangerous and atrocious. Based on the concepts presented I feel like none of these concepts are acceptable at this time. In my opinion, I do not feel [sic] that the options offered are NOT adequate enough to alleviate the traffic issues on SH 361/181.</p> <p>I feel that there are not enough options to give a dedicated route for those who reside in these areas around the industrial/worker traffic in and out of the industrial locations and causing backup and dangerous conditions. There has to be another way for the thousands of people who WORK these areas versus those who LIVE in the area but must travel it to get to and from work safely. There has to be another way.</p> <p>The option of a SPUI is not enough to get the congestion under control and get traffic moving. Why would we want a large capacity highway interchange to STOP at a lighted intersection? That is a problem in and of itself. Keep traffic moving. There is too much traffic, too many dangers and not enough of a dedicated area for those who need live in the area. The traffic for the industrial areas along 35/181/361 could all be rescheduled to avoid peak hours of travel, but this is not feasible for their businesses. I personally do not have an issue with the train traffic, I have lived here for 20 years and it has not bothered me, most of the delay is minimal when I have had to encounter it. The facility traffic and lack of feeder road access for the employees who cause wrecks and back up traffic onto 101/35 are the issue.</p> <p>Please do not start this project before you finish the spaghetti mess at Gregory/Portland flyover or before you complete the highway project in Ingleside that has been in the works for over a decade. One project at a time, PLEASE!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>Concepts for SH 361 were developed keeping in mind the various origins and destinations in the region, current and future traffic volumes, crash data, and public input. Based on initial traffic analysis and available right of way, Concept E provides for increased capacity, efficiency, and safety for the traveling public. As noted in the presentation, the SPUI requires only one traffic signal and thus minimizes delay compared to a typical diamond interchange, while also minimizing costs and reducing impacts to adjacent properties. Your comments along with others received will be reviewed and considered by the project team.</p> <p>The SPUI option, along with the additional improvements to the weaving and merging areas, are expected to improve safety thereby reducing the frequency of crashes. The currently proposed design does not preclude construction of certain direct connectors at a future date as traffic increases.</p> <p>Thank you for your input regarding areas of concern and priority projects.</p>