



COMMENTS AND RESPONSES MATRIX



SH 34 Feasibility Study, 0173-07-054, 0173-06-042
 Project Name (ie.CCSJ)
 Deliverable Owner
 Project Manager
 TxDOT District/ Division
 Paris

Review Comment Resolution Form

FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY REVIEWER			FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY COMMENT OWNER			
Document Name	Submittal Phase	Reviewer Name	Reviewer Comment	Comment Owner	Action	Response
DRAINAGE REPORT	DRAFT	Syd Newman	Page 6: this statement is confusing - your EBD coefficients are based on the 2004 USGS Atlas for Texas, which is OK for this study, and NOAA Atlas 14 is new (2018) - please rewrite accordingly	PM	Agree	Deleted the statement to avoid confusion
DRAINAGE REPORT	DRAFT	Syd Newman	Page 8: in Table 2-2, You actually encounter some C and B soils, but they are less than 5% of the area, so it's OK to disregard, just make a statement saying so.	PM	Agree	Added a statement stating: the soils less than 5% in area are considered negligible and were not considered in the calculations
DRAINAGE REPORT	DRAFT	Syd Newman	Page 15: Table 3-5, This (Tc=26.77) looks suspiciously low, please double check calcs	PM	Agree	Updated the table to reflect the correct time of concentration
DRAINAGE REPORT	DRAFT	Syd Newman	Page 16: Table 3-5 #29 (Tc= 21.82) check this one, too	PM	Agree	Updated the table to reflect the correct time of concentration
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Darius Samuels	Page 5: SH 34 and FM 2101, Traffic signals were installed at this intersection in 2018	PM	Agree	At the time this study was initiated,
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Darius Samuels	Provide Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis for SH 34 & FM 1903 intersection	PM	Agree	Will provide a traffic signal warrant analysis for SH 34 & FM 1903 intersection
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Darius Samuels	Page 15: SH 34 & E SH 276, Are these improvements not happening in the SH 276 bypass project?	PM	Agree	As a part of SH 276 By-Pass project, southbound left-turn and northbound right-turn are being added.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 3: should probably mention the limits as well, people might assume US 77 to US 82 are the limits	PM	Agree	Will revise per comment.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 6: SH 34 and Traders Road, recommend adding that the two-through lanes narrow down to one-lane just south of the intersection.	PM	Agree	Will revise per comment.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 6: SH 34 & FM 1570: it also has a RT-lane	PM	Disagree	Existing configuration shows shared right-turn lane. There should be a separate deceleration and storage length to be coded as separate turn lane.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 11: Is MVMPT spelled out somewhere? If not, it should be spelled out the first time you use it.	PM	Agree	Will spell MVMPT as Million Vehicle Miles Traveled (MVMPT) the first time.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 20: The turnaround lane isn't represented here... Is there a reason?	PM	Agree	Turnaround traffic does not contribute to the study limits. As a part of signalized intersection analysis, we only included lane configurations controlled by traffic signal.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 21: Pointing to arrow on Sheet 21, looks like this should be removed	PM	Agree	Will revise to show all movements in one sheet.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 22: are the RT's represented as free flowing?	PM	Agree	Yes, they are represented as free flowing.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 22: The u-turn isn't represented here either.	PM	Agree	Turnaround traffic does not contribute to the study limits. As a part of signalized intersection analysis, we only included lane configurations controlled by traffic signal.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 24: The thru and right turn are separate, the right turn is almost free flowing	PM	Disagree	Existing configuration shows shared right-turn lane. There should be a separate deceleration and storage length to be coded as separate turn lane.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 24: This should be separated as it was on WB I-30	PM	Disagree	Existing configuration shows shared right-turn lane. There should be a separate deceleration and storage length to be coded as separate turn lane.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 25: Pointing to arrow on Sheet 25, this needs to be moved or deleted	PM	Agree	Will revise to show all movements in one sheet.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 27: at what point is it not considered a RT-lane?	PM	Disagree	Existing configuration shows shared right-turn lane. There should be a separate deceleration and storage length to be coded as separate turn lane.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 31: shouldn't this be separated? is there a certain storage criteria that needs to be met to separate?	PM	Disagree	Existing configuration shows shared right-turn lane. There should be a separate deceleration and storage length to be coded as separate turn lane.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Page 50: is this a report within a report? It's not in the appendices or table of contents	PM	Agree	Will separate existing and future traffic analysis reports as separate to avoid any confusion and will be referenced accordingly in the Table of Contents.



SH 34 Feasibility Study, 0173-07-054, 0173-06-042
Project Name (ie.CCSJ)
Deliverable Owner
TxDOT District/ Division
Project Manager
Paris

Review Comment Resolution Form

FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY REVIEWER			FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY COMMENT OWNER			
Document Name	Submittal Phase	Reviewer Name	Reviewer Comment	Comment Owner	Action	Response
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Is sheet 100 a blank sheet? If it doesn't need to be there, please remove	PM	Agree	Will remove blank sheet.
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Remove "er" from, "Total Number of Commenters", as we received 29 comments and some of the commenters submitted more than one comment.	PM	Agree	Will review summary and adjust accordingly.
FEASIBILITY STUDY	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Include Environmental Constraints map	PM	Agree	Will include in the feasibility report.
FEASIBILITY STUDY	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	It's not clear that there were alternatives evaluated, per the contract in the Alternative Evaluation and Scoring please incorporate into the document	PM	Agree	Will include in the feasibility report.
FEASIBILITY STUDY	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Incorporate environmental studies and Public Meeting Summaries	PM	Agree	Will include in the feasibility report.
FEASIBILITY STUDY	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	All reports/work performed needs to be submitted and encapsulated in the Feasibility study	PM	Agree	Will include in the feasibility report.
PROPERTY/ROW BASE MAP	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Please verify the Proposed Roadway/ROW is lined up properly, it appears the roadway is being widened to the east and more ROW will be purchased from the east side as well.	PM	Agree	Please see attached revised ROW/Property Base Maps
ROW BASE MAP	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	thanks for responding with the potential displacements, they need to be incorporated into the DSR.	PM	Agree	Will add this information to the DSR form
UTILITY BASE MAP	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Add following information: type of utility, size of utility, whether they are underground/overground	PM	Agree	Please see attached utility layout base map on the information received from utility companies
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	The ten criteria in here are different from those listed in feasibility study.	PM	Disagree	The ten criteria used for reviewing the alternatives are in keeping with the discussion headings in the Future Conditions methodology (Additional Lane Benefits are mentioned in the Long-Term Solutions)
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	The cost of land acquisition is assuming the same for all 3 alternatives just because amount of land required for the project is the same, that doesn't mean that it will be equivalent ROW purchase on each side.	PM	Agree	Option A -2, Option B -3, Option C -4 All three options would require proposed new right-of-way (ROW) and result in potential residential and business displacements. Option A would result in approximately 73 displacements, Option B would result in approximately 55 displacements and Option C would result in approximately 24 displacements. We utilized \$7 per sq.ft for Commercial and \$17,500 per acre for non-commercial uses.
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Construction Cost (ROW cost) – As explained before, purchasing land from a private home is priced different than that from a business or depending on what city.	PM	Agree	We utilized \$7 per sq.ft for Commercial and \$17,500 per acre for non-commercial uses.
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Right-Of-Way Benefits – How are all 3 options awarded the same points?	PM	Agree	Acquiring ROW on either side would provide equal benefits throughout the length of the project for all alternatives.
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Community Impact – need to describe what each option scored, you just listed one.	PM	Agree	Option A - 1; Option B - 2; Option C - 3 Option A would result in 73 displacements, Option B would result in 55 displacements and Option C in 24 displacements



Project Name (ie.CCSJ)	SH 34 Feasibility Study, 0173-07-054, 0173-06-042
Deliverable Owner	Project Manager
TxDOT District/ Division	Paris

Review Comment Resolution Form

FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY REVIEWER		FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY COMMENT OWNER				
Document Name	Submittal Phase	Reviewer Name	Reviewer Comment	Comment Owner	Action	Response
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	•Would the whooping cranes be impacted by the three alignments? •What is the environment impact of "vast open spaces"?	PM	Agree	Option A -2, Option B -2, Option C-2. Based on the information previously submitted, here is our response: The previous information for whooping crane was coded incorrectly in the GIS database. We apologize, but that information has been removed from the constraints write-up. The NDD data shows a polygon in the southern portion of the study area as a rookery (blue heron and egret). The NDD data does not show any previously recorded federal or state species for the SH 34 study area. A qualified biologist would conduct a habitat assessment to determine if there may be suitable habitat for any federal or state species should the project advance to the next phase of project development.
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Drainage impact	PM	Agree	All 3 options were scored 3, as the drainage analysis shows that over all impacts can be accommodated within the available/proposed ROW.
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Mobility – what did they score?	PM	Agree	Option A - 2; Option B - 2; Option C - 2. Overall the project provides improved mobility along the corridor once the construction is complete. However, there will be some impacts during construction such as access, travel times.
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	DRAFT	Nancy Peron	Safety Benefits – what did the others rank?	PM	Agree	Option A - 3; Option B -3; Option C - 3 Overall the project provides safety benefits during short-, mid-, and long-term conditions.
ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENTS	90%	Nancy Peron	Hatch in roadway to be removed/obliterated	PM	Agree	Exhibit revised per comment
ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENTS 2	90%	Nancy Peron	Show property's new access to roadway	PM	Agree	Access to the property is now shown on the exhibits
COST ESTIMATES	90%	Nancy Peron	The signing is lump sum and equal for both estimates, how was cost determined? Is this cost different from the primary alignment?	PM	Agree	The cost was adjusted from the original alignment
COST ESTIMATES	90%	Nancy Peron	Add estimate of current proposed alignment portion for comparison of alignments	PM	Agree	Current alignment portion was added for comparison purposes
PROS & CONS	90%	Nancy Peron	If the feasibility is replacing the bridges regardless, how is replacing the bridge different from other alignments?	PM	Agree	Please see attached report for more information
PROS & CONS	90%	Nancy Peron	Include the benefit of improved radius and a con of sharp turn	PM	Agree	Please see attached report for more information
PROS & CONS	90%	Nancy Peron	Impact of buildings are listed, but what's the impact? Are there buildings being displaced? This should be accounted for in the ROW estimate as well	PM	Agree	Please see attached report for more information
ROW ESTIMATES	90%	Nancy Peron	Utility relocation estimate determined? Both alternatives are lump sum but different	PM	Agree	Please see attached report for more information
EXISTING PROFILE LAYOUT	90%	Nancy Peron	The profile needs to show the existing and proposed centerline, the ROW profiles are not necessary.	PM	Agree	We will prepare the conceptual design profile for the proposed conditions. With the available information from TNIRIS LIDAR data, we assume that proposed roadway centerline will match with existing roadway centerline profile. The proposed roadway profile will follow the existing roadway profile. Note will be added on the plot and DSR accordingly.



Project Name (ie.CCS.)
 Deliverable Owner
 TxDOT District/ Division

0173-07-054, 0173-06-042
 Nancy Peron
 Paris

Review Comment Resolution Form

FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY REVIEWER				FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY COMMENT OWNER			
Document Name	Submittal Phase	Reviewer Name	Reviewer Comment	Comment Owner	Action	Response	Response
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	The results of the alternative alignment is part of the study and should be included in this document and in the conclusion.	PM		Table and text added.	The Alternative Alignment isn't mentioned in the conclusion, a preferred alignment should be recommended
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page iv, paragraph 2, 2nd sentence: Close or delete parenthesis.	PM		Changed.	Added Alternative Alignment information in the conclusions
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page iv, paragraph 3, 1st sentence: Capitalize "positive" as its the first word in the sentence.	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Correct Headers and Footers throughout document; page 7 has footer for Ch 1 when it's the TOC. This is also an issue on sheets 8,14,15,18. This should have been caught in QA/QC	PM		Both Headers, and Footers have been corrected.	Should add headers and footers to entire document, i.e. all exhibits
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	What is a "satellite table"	PM		Changed.	Added headers and footers throughout the report including appendices, and exhibits
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 21, paragraph 5, last sentence: add, "and addressed" after, "... to in included and addressed" in the Public Meeting Documentation", as there are comment responses	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 13, last paragraph, last sentence: (for the 2018 meeting only), should replace "meeting" with "meetings"	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 22, Paragraph 6, 2nd sentence: remove "I" after, "in 2018."	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 22, Paragraph 6, 2nd sentence: a space is needed after the word, "generated"	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 22, last paragraph, sentence 4: replace, "either at" with "from", and replace "or via" with "and"	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 23, last sentence: looks like a portion of this sentence is missing	PM		Added the phrase, "... used the SH 34 corridor."	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	page 27 & 28, see comment 4	PM		Both Headers, and Footers have been corrected.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 28, Roadway Characteristics is missing from the TOC	PM		There is no heading called "Roadway Characteristics".	comment was addressed by removing Roadway Characteristics from TOC
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 28, Transit is Alternative Transportation Options in document, they need to be the same	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 29, 1st Paragraph, 3rd sentence: remove "small", the size of the city is irrelevant and relative.	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 31, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence doesn't make sense: rewrite.	PM		Removed unintelligible phrase.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 32, Figure 10 is missing	PM		Figure added.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 32, last sentence: add "below" after, "Table 4"	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 33, 1st sentence: include the day of the week the counts were performed.	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	LOS D is acceptable for heavily developed urban areas; roadways should be designed for LOS B.	PM		The target for intersections is LOS D. However, for roadways it will be LOS B.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	What happened to the footings?	PM		They have been added.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Sheet 40, Crashes: 29+25+38+34 = 171, not 114; 14+12+16+19+12+7+3; not 68. 5+13+9+8+9=44, not 34; 10+9+9+10+13=51, not 41; 19+24+21+30+5=99, not 57; 9+11+14+9+6=49, not 40. Per our conversation, these numbers need to be updated, this should have also been caught in QA/QC	PM		Changed.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 45, Does not match the TOC (Table of Contents)	PM		All headings are reflected in the TOC.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 47, paragraph 4: Slower traffic, more acceleration from stop and go decreases air quality.	PM		There would be moderate negative environmental impacts for the no-build option. Traffic growth would oustrip existing capacity leading to increased traffic congestion and higher frequency of stop-and-go. Both these factors would increase vehicular emissions.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 54, 3rd paragraph: Utility impacts and proposed ROW were reviewed, it should be noted if utility relocation or ROW will have an impact on replacing the bridges. At least list the known utilities that need to be relocated and the estimated amount of ROW	PM		At FM 2101 there are three utilities that maybe required to be relocated or adjusted. These are: Over-Head Fiber Optic Cables (FOC), underground FOC, and natural-gas pipeline. At South of Quilinan, there are the following utilities: Over-Head FOC, underground FOC, natural-gas pipeline, and a water pipeline	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 61, 1st paragraph, last sentence: Would changing the CL to accommodate options A or B result in replacing or adding pavement?	PM		Changing the CL towards either Option A or B will result in adding pavement.	
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 61, 2nd paragraph: Are there no time savings between working in one side as opposed to both? It would make a difference in TCP and lane closures	PM		Traffic will need to shift to one-half of the road while the other half is constructed in all cases.	Construction Cost - title needs to be moved to page with its content.
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 61, 3rd paragraph, last sentence: What criteria was used to determine if a building would be considered displaced?	PM		If the building is touching or within 10 foot of the ROW, then it is considered "displaced".	Revised per comment
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 61, paragraph 4: How does this optimize minimize disruptions?	PM		REWORKED.	

Project Name (ie.CCS.)	0173-07-054, 0173-06-042
Deliverable Owner	Nancy Peron
TXDOT District/ Division	Paris

Review Comment Resolution Form

FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY REVIEWER				FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY COMMENT OWNER			
Document Name	Submittal Phase	Reviewer Name	Reviewer Comment	Comment Owner	Action	Response	Review Response
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 61, paragraph 4: Are the displacements from the other options not privately held allotments?	PM		REWOURED.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 61, paragraph 4: what cost to the community does Option C have that the others dont? This paragraph needs more explanation	PM		REWOURED.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 62, paragraph 4: indicate if any of these will be impacted by Alternatives A-C, same for petroleum pipelines, water wells, arch, and streams.	PM		REWOURED.	This paragraph was not reworded
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 64, paragraph 4: this needs to be more than just about vegetation	PM		Added other constraints: Reference Table 15.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Table 15: Are these actual impacts, or just items that are in the vicinity? This carries more weight than just vegetation and should be included.	PM		We have included this in the new wording.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 66: 1st paragraph: The rest of the chapter strayed from being an Alternative Analysis and scoring, the rest of the chapter needs to be updated to include how the alternatives scored in this area.	PM		Points criteria added.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 66: 1st paragraph: Appendix C reference: IS there a difference between the alternatives? This should be listed, not just reference an appendices	PM		There is no difference among the three alternatives.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	The impact should be summarized, don't just state that 42' of ROW would be required.	PM		42' of ROW would be required to widen the existing roadway to accommodate future traffic growth, address congestion and safety issues.	the displacement numbers vary from 24 to 73, while the need for 42' of ROW for each alternative might be the same, the impact of displacements is going to increase that width with various parcels.
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 66, paragraph 5: in what way? Option C purchases Row from both sides increasing the number of affected property owners.	PM		Paragraph deleted, and replaced.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 69, paragraph 3, last sentence: IS this based on less parcels or less area?	PM		In terms of displacements.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	page 1273, G. Existing constraints. 8. - the cemetery is names Odd Fellow, not Old Fellow	PM		Changed.	It's "Odd Fellow" not "Odd Fellows", remove the s
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 1376, the cemetery is names Odd Fellow, not Old Fellow	PM		Changed.	change was not made
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 1402: There's a point that's not listed that could be impacted by proposed ROW	PM		Added in Long-Term Conditions Build (ROW Impacts)	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 1408 - This document should include Boles Home/Alternative	PM		Added after Long-Term Conditions Build (Additional Lanes Benefit)	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 1408 - 1st sentence, doesn't look like this sentence was started properly, looks like there's content missing	PM		Capitalization error. Now corrected.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 1409 - 3rd paragraph - are these displacements or the number of properties we'll be purchasing from?	PM		These are displacements.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 1409, paragraph 4: What are the equal benefits?	PM		Please refer to response in comment in row #43 above.	refer to response in comment row 43
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	Page 1410, paragraph 4 - Option C would involve construction on both sides. Depending on how that's planned it could mean longer construction or both sides having limited access at the same time. How are they all awarded the same number of points?	PM		Mobility Benefits are assessed based on their long-term potential. Improvements are stated and alternatives are penalized equally for short-term inconvenience.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	The proposed ROW acreage is the Excel sheets do not match what's in the environmental constraints document. (Displacements are properties that we'll purchase and remove a building. In which case we'll purchase the building increasing the acreage we'll purchase from a property). It sounds like you're trying to distinguish between the number of parcels (# of properties we'll purchase any land from) and the number of parcels with displacements.) How many parcels are we purchasing from and how many parcels are we purchase from that will include displacing a building for each alternative?	PM		Attached are corrected spreadsheets with parcel information.	✓
SH 34 Feasibility study	95%	N. Peron	I'm seeing cemeteries, churches and the Cash Fire Department, were the likelihood of those displacements looked into on the alternative analysis? Are we purchasing ROW from these places or are they being displaced? Is the acreage identifying what's in the study area or what's going to be impacted? Either the tables need more detail or the table needs to be described better in the paragraph.	PM		Yes, cemeteries, churches and the Cash Fire Department along with schools and other features were reviewed in the Environmental constraints memo and provided for the alternatives analysis for the three alternatives and the study area. The attached spreadsheets list the displacements that were identified and the impacts to these features are also included in the "Preliminary Environmental Constraints for Long-Term Improvements" table in the attached draft constraints memo.	✓
Page 208		N. Peron	Additional Comments you have an index for meeting photographs, but no photographs to go with it	PM		Photos have been added.	



0173-07-054, 0173-06-042
Project Name (ie.CCS.)
Deliverable Owner
TXDOT District/ Division

Review Comment Resolution Form

FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY REVIEWER				FIELDS TO BE FILLED IN BY COMMENT OWNER				
Document Name	Submittal Phase	Reviewer Name	Reviewer Comment	Comment Owner	Action	Response	Review Response	Response
Page 69		N. Peron	Construction Disruption - 1st sentence - remove "gr" from "within" options?	PM		Changed.		
Page 70		N. Peron	The Boles home alternative isn't mentioned in the recommendations, is it recommended to pursue one of the options?	PM		Added.		
Page 841		N. Peron	As previously requested, replace ALL "Old Fellow" with "Odd Fellow" in all documents	PM		Changed.		
Study		N. Peron	Remove "Gunda" Logo from all documents	PM		Removed.		
Page 8		N. Peron	Doesn't match TOC, needs to add Conclusion	PM		Changed.		
Page 27		N. Peron	"Options" needs to be brought up with "Alternative Transportation", as it is in the document and TOC	PM		Changed.		
Study		N. Peron	Mention Boles Home Alternatives results in the Conclusion	PM		Changed		
Appendix F		N. Peron	Needs to be rewritten with regards ROW impacts	PM		Changed		
Appendix F/Study Area		N. Peron	Change reason for project from congestion to increased accidents.	PM		Changed		