

**US 281 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING #6
JUNE 22, 2011
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.
STONE OAK METHODIST HOSPITAL
CLASSROOMS 1 AND 2**

Members/Alternates Present	
Ronnie Barbera (Alternate)	Stone Oak Business Association
Peter Bella	Alamo Area Council of Governments
Mel Borel	San Antonio Toll Party
Jenna Cantwell (Alternate)	Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance
Terry Dudley	Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance
Gina Groomer-Barbera	Stone Oak Business Association
Terri Hall	Texans Uniting for Reform and Freedom
Bob Liesman (Alternate)	Professional Engineers in Private Practice
Charles McBride	Summerglen Homeowners Association
Dick McNary	North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce
Jerry Morrissey	Alamo Sierra Club
Brigitte Perkins	Northeast Independent School District
Chuck Purkiss (Alternate)	Town of Hollywood Park
Tim Rice	Cavalo Creek Homeowners Association
Sudie Sartor	Town of Hollywood Park
Tom Troll	Encino Park Homeowners Association
Susan Wright	Cibolo Canyons Resort Community, Inc.
Members/Alternates Not Present	
Palmira Arellano	Methodist Stone oak Hospital
Toni Bell	Emerald Forest HOA
Jim Binkley	Comal County
John Bulleri (Alternate)	Timberwood Park
Monette Fisher	Big Springs HOA
Charles P. "Frosty" Forster	Professional Engineers in Private Practice
Greg Gibson	Real Estate Council of San Antonio
Cindy Griffin	Timberwood park
David Heidenrich	Mountain Lodge HOA
Todd Helmer	Greater San Antonio Builders Association
Diane Hoskins (Alternate)	Professional Engineers in Private Practice
Greg James	San Antonio Water System
Daryl Lange (Alternate)	Real Estate Council of San Antonio
Keith Lindsey	Lookout Canyon Property Owners Association
Viki Melton	Stone Oak Property Owners Association
Joseph Mlodzianowski	District 9

Al Moursund (Alternate)	District 9 Neighborhood Alliance
Keith T. Parker	VIA Metropolitan Transit Authority
Annalisa Peace (Alternate)	Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance
John Pierret (Alternate)	Cibolo Canyons Resort Community, Inc.
Al Rocha	Bexar Met
Jon Thompson	Aquifer Guardians in Urban Areas
US 281 EIS Team Present	
Lisa Adelman	Alamo Regional Mobility Authority
Leroy Alloway	Alamo Regional Mobility Authority
Linda Alvarado-Vela	Ximenes & Associates, Inc.
Tom Beeman	Texas Department of Transportation
Terry Brechtel	Alamo Regional Mobility Authority
Tricia Bruck	Jacobs
Tom Bruechert	Federal Highway Administration
David Elizondo	HNTB
Justin Ham	Federal Highway Administration
Michelle Martinez	Alamo Regional Mobility Authority
Jim Robertson	Jacobs
Stephanie Messerli	Jacobs
Linda Ximenes	Ximenes & Associates, Inc.
Others Present	
Bob Sartor	Town of Hollywood Park

FINAL MEETING NOTES

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Linda Ximenes thanked everyone for attending the sixth meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) for the US 281 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She introduced several new members: Sudie Sartor and Chuck Purkiss representing the Town of Hollywood Park; Jenna Cantwell as the alternate representing the Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance; and Bob Liesman as an alternate representing the Professional Engineers in Private Practice (PEPP). Hollywood Park is a Participating Agency in the EIS and is represented as a member of the CAC.

REVIEW OF DESIRED OUTCOMES FOR THIS MEETING

Ms. Ximenes reviewed the desired outcomes for the meeting and the agenda with the group, indicating that Jimmy Robertson and Stephanie Messerli would be making the presentations regarding the Build Alternatives. The results sought from this meeting were to:

- 1) Provide an update and discuss the refinement of Build Alternatives including: Design Refinements, Key Measures of Effectiveness and Preliminary Cost Estimates
- 2) Discuss how the Build Alternatives meet the Need and Purpose

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 16, 2011 MEETING

The minutes were approved as submitted.

PRESENTATION ON REFINEMENT OF BUILD ALTERNATIVES

Jimmy Robertson explained to the group that although the EIS Team has been working on all three build alternatives, there has been a focus on Overpass/Expansion (also referred to as Alternative 1) in an effort to determine if a lower cost, smaller footprint alternative could meet the need and purpose of this project.

Conceptual schematics have been developed and submitted to the Design Division of the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) for review and comment. They were available for review by the committee members at this meeting.

Monthly e-newsletters have been distributed and if anyone would like to be added to the distribution list, they can sign up on the website www.411on281.com/us281eis.

Since the last CAC meeting in February 2011, the EIS Team has been working on the Draft EIS; and documenting scoping concurrence, which is a procedural step in the EIS process where the Alamo RMA, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and TxDOT have the opportunity to formally concur on several items including: the need and purpose for improvements to US 281, the alternatives being considered, the methods and level of detail proposed to analyze each alternative.

The EIS Team has also been coordinating with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding the biological surveys along the US 281 corridor. There were no observations of endangered or threatened karst invertebrates within the corridor; and during two years of bird surveys there were no observations of threatened or endangered avian species. Based on these bird surveys, the USFWS concurred that a third year of bird survey would not be required.

Mr. Robertson explained that the four direct connectors on the southern side of the project are currently under construction, but the four northern direct connectors are part of the US 281 EIS. If the northern direct connectors were constructed, the US 281/Loop 1604 interchange would be a five level interchange.

He reviewed the need, purpose and objectives for the project and explained that many of the objectives helped drive the design.

PRESENTATION ON REFINEMENT OF BUILD ALTERNATIVES

Stephanie Messerli began her presentation by showing Overpass/Expansion as it was presented in April 2010 and the changes made in an effort to keep it as a smaller footprint, lower cost approach to addressing the project's Need and Purpose. In April 2010 this alternative proposed new grade separated intersections at Redland Road, Encino Rio, Evans Road, Stone Oak Parkway, Marshall Road, Wilderness Oaks, Overlook Parkway, Bulverde Road, and Borgfeld Drive. The Overpass/Expansion Alternative was presented with driveways and side streets colored red in numerous locations and noted that "Direct access

may not be allowed as shown due to safety concerns. Further analysis is required to determine safe access solutions. Solutions include frontage roads, backage roads, and purchase of access rights.” In addition to safe access, other measures of effectiveness like average peak period travel speed, average daily traffic, and peak period level of service were also lower than the Expressway and Elevated Expressway alternatives. In the months following the April 2010 public meeting the US 281 EIS Team worked to identify safe access solutions and improve mobility performance.

The US 281 EIS Team analyzed two variations of the original Overpass/Expansion Alternative presented at Public Meeting #3 in April 2010. The first variation was presented to the CAC in October 2010. The second variation was presented to the CAC in February 2011. Slide presentations made at all CAC meetings are posted to the project web site, available for viewing at <http://www.411on281.com/us281eis/>.

October 2010: Design changes were made to the Overpass/Expansion Alternative between April 2010 and October 2010 in an effort to address safe access and improve mobility performance while retaining the original “smaller footprint, lower cost” intent of this alternative. Frontage roads were added between Loop 1604 and Stone Oak Parkway to provide safe access to the adjacent land uses. North of Stone Oak Parkway, traffic signals replaced originally proposed overpasses at Marshall Road, Wilderness Oaks, Overlook Parkway, Bulverde Road, and Borgfeld Drive, and an additional travel lane in each direction was added. Additionally, proposed right-of-way was expanded to include storm water management features. It should be noted here that the SA-BC MPO travel demand model was modified in June 2010 which resulted in slightly different metrics, even for those alternatives that did not change.

The revised alternative still substantially underperformed the Expressway Alternative and the Elevated Expressway Alternative.

February 2011: In order to mitigate safe access concerns and improve mobility in the northern section of US 281, additional changes were made to the October 2010 version. Overpasses were added to major intersections from Marshall Road to Borgfeld Drive in order to improve mobility along US 281. Short sections of discontinuous access roads and parallel driveways were included to provide safe access to the land uses along US 281. The US 281 EIS Team also investigated other strategies for addressing safe access, such as the acquisition of access rights and the construction of backage roads. These approaches were found to be prohibitively expensive (acquisition of access rights) and environmentally harmful (construction of backage roads).

The addition of overpasses and discontinuous access roads north of Stone Oak Parkway to the Overpass/Expansion Alternative improved the measures of effectiveness. Also, in most cases, the discontinuous access roads required a circuitous route for accessing the adjacent land uses, in turn creating “choke points” where traffic would have to make sharp u-turns, pass through multiple signals, and/or quickly accelerate/decelerate to avoid conflicts with the faster moving main lane traffic.

In summary, during the effort to analyze safe access solutions it was determined that the safest and most economical access could be provided by the use of a frontage road in most locations. To incorporate frontage roads throughout the corridor would provide an alternative that was very similar to the Expressway Alternative – Non-toll. After extensive traffic and engineering analysis, the “smaller footprint, lower cost” approach was not found to adequately address the access and mobility needs of the project. Therefore a recommendation was made that the Overpass/Expansion Alternative would have the same design as Expressway Alternative, but be considered for non-toll lanes only.

The Expressway Alternative is now only being considered with tolled or managed lane options. It would have two to three main lanes in each direction with frontage roads from Loop 1604 to Borgfeld Drive.

The Elevated Expressway Alternative would have two to three elevated main lanes in each direction from Loop 1604 to Borgfeld Drive. The existing US 281 lanes would remain in place and be used as frontage roads. It is being considered for non-toll, tolled and managed lane options.

Mrs. Messerli also reviewed the key measures of effectiveness – average peak period speeds, vehicles per day, additional acres of impervious cover, additional acres of right of way, and the preliminary cost estimates – for each of the three Build Alternatives.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Robertson and Mrs. Messerli asked the group if they had any questions at this point in the presentation. Below are the questions and answers:

- Where does it say the average peak period speed?¹ *EIS Team Response: On slide 13 it shows the average speed—all speeds are shown as the average peak period speed. The slides are divided between the northern section – US 281 south of Bulverde Road – and the southern section – US 281 north of Sonterra Blvd. (Slides 22 and 23 and 32 and 33 also show the peak periods.) Slide 23 should say “Average Peak Period.”*
- Originally, the premise of the EIS was that we were going to look at the best way to get the traffic flow through and that the toll issue would be a funding issue. Overpass/Expansion was a non-tolled alternative. Now that we have two alternatives that are the same except for tolling and managed lanes or non-tolling, are we going to be boxed into supporting an alternative that is tolled or non-tolled? Where are we today if a non-tolled alternative becomes a phased Overpass/Expansion? *EIS Team Response: We wanted to talk to you about funding options and construction issues related to the build alternatives. However, funding is not a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) issue. The current SA-BC MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) has this project financed by tolls. If the MTP was amended, additional funding from non-tolled sources would have to be found. Given the current situation of transportation funding, this project would probably need to be phased over a period of time. It is hard to say over*

¹ In this section of the notes, plain text indicates the question asked or the comment made by the CAC member and the *italicized text* is the response from the US 281 EIS Team.

how long because those funding sources are not known at this time. It could be several phases stretched out over 20 years or more.

In the tolled or managed lane options it would be possible to acquire the lump sum needed to build a project all at once so the improvements could be constructed continuously and not have to wait for funding sources to become available. An analysis on the impacts of a tolled lane option on Environmental Justice populations [minority or low-income populations] will be included in the Draft EIS.

- How is multimodal transportation included in the EIS? *EIS Team Response: All Build Alternatives include facilities for multi-modal transportation. All build alternatives include a Park-n-Ride at Stone Oak Parkway and the inclusion of a multi-use path about 10 ft wide for bicycles and pedestrians. The path would not necessarily be continuous on both sides but could meander from side to side using crosswalks. All Build Alternatives include an envelope in the right-of-way for future high capacity transit.*
- Can you talk about quality of life and noise impacts? It is noisy already and will probably get noisier. *EIS Team Response: There will be noise impacts from all the alternatives (including the No-Build Alternative). Noise impacts for each alternative will be analyzed in the Draft EIS as well as noise abatement measures.*
- Are you going to measure the pollution they are going to be eating by using the multi use trail? *EIS Team Response: Yes, an analysis of air quality for residences and businesses as well as pedestrians and other users, and mitigation measures will be included in the Draft EIS.*

Mr. Robertson finished the rest of the presentation that included slides on the steps of the EIS process that have been completed and the next steps in the process. He asked if there were any other questions. The following reflects the questions and answers at this point.

- Once the Draft EIS and the Final EIS are completed, who makes the decision about the project? *EIS Team Response: FHWA makes the decision. When we suggested a three-year schedule we assumed there could be some expedited review and what we are seeing instead is a lot of careful scrutiny looking at each step of the process. What we thought could be a three-or-four-year project will end up being a four-to-five-year project. That's just the nature of the beast. It's going to take longer than we had planned.*
- Why doesn't the CAC get a draft prior to others? *EIS Team Response: We will provide the Draft EIS to all CAC members, after the document has been approved by FHWA for distribution to the public.*
- Why are the dates not set? Why not work towards an end date? *EIS Team Response: It is very difficult to set dates for an EIS; US 281 is not the only project that FHWA and TxDOT are working on. There are a lot of needs throughout the state.*

Can you go to slide 38? It is interesting what is left off on the toll alternative in particular. If you look at what is listed for non-toll everything is negative and everything

under toll/managed the bullets are all positive. On all your alternatives you count vehicles on all lanes – frontage roads and main lanes combined. How can you not consider how much of that traffic gets pushed onto the frontage road when you have a tolled alternative vs. when you have a non-tolled alternative? I think where the vehicles will travel has a huge impact on how fast people will travel. The distribution of where the cars are going has a huge impact on the speed, travel and efficiency of the roadway. I understand there will not be a traffic revenue study before they decide on the Preferred Alternative. *EIS Team Response: The Alamo RMA is conducting a traffic and revenue study at the present time and is still exploring all financing options.*

How can the public have meaningful input if we do not know how toll viable the alternative is? It says on the slide that the tolled option will be funded by bonds and paid back by the users. I can tell you this road is barely 50 percent toll viable based on previous studies. We already know this. So, in the draft it should say “depending on the toll viability.” When a person is looking at it to choose a Preferred Alternative, it is being paid by highway taxes and you have to pay a toll to use it, but it does not say that. *EIS Team Response: The Alamo RMA does have an Investment Grade Traffic and Revenue Study that was completed in 2007. They have not determined how to fund this project. In 2007 when the Alamo RMA was working to get US 281 financed as a toll road they went to Moody’s Investor Services and got the indicative credit rating to move this forward. They did get an assessment that indicated it was toll viable with the proposed funding package. This funding package included \$120 million in public equity.*

- Some toll roads in Austin and Houston are not being used and are being subsidized by the taxpayers each and every year.
- TxDOT funding has increased, even in this down economy.
- There was a blanket statement about toll roads not being successful, and it is important to understand on all sides of the discussion to be careful not to over-generalize in either direction.
- Isn’t the charge of this committee to present the options and let the legislators and funders figure out how to do it? *EIS Team Response: The SA-BC MPO is the body that decides how transportation dollars are spent. Their MTP has to be financially constrained – either they have a project funded through non-tolled sources, or they have toll-financed projects. If you move a project out of one funding category you need to move something else around. [Note: At present, there is \$216 Million for new capacity available to the SA-BC MPO based on the 2035 MTP over the next 25 years, \$112 Million of which is allocated to the US 281 corridor.]*

But is it part of our committee to do this? *EIS Team Response: It is the SA-BC MPO Policy Board’s decision; it is not this committee that decides the funding. This is an advisory committee.*

- Please don't ask us to pick between Overpass/Expansion and Expressway, especially since they are essentially the same now; just have us pick between the expressway and the elevated expressway. *EIS Team Response: After several attempts to design a low-cost, smaller footprint option that was different from Expressway, we were not able to get there. Overpass/Expansion could still be kept as a non-toll option, and the policy makers could decide later on how to fund it. It seemed important to us to be able to demonstrate the progression of Overpass/Expansion rather than just eliminate it.*
- When I interpret what's in the Draft EIS and what we are trying to do, I think the social, environmental and economic impacts are going to be drastically different for a non-tolled or a toll road. If it is free access you are just going to see more growth and development. A toll road is likely to deter people from living out there or even going out there, which is better for the aquifer recharge zone. I think we need to keep them separate in the Draft EIS because their impact is going to be very different.
- I was going to say something along the same lines. I think a longer build out means an extended impact to air quality. I think those are reasonable points – Overpass/Expansion and Expressway may have the same asphalt and costs, but the environmental impacts will be different.
- I guess what drove Overpass/Expansion to Expressway was mobility or speed and safety. Were we going to settle for lower speed? Why did you spend all that time to demonstrate that speed and mobility are important? What was the point spending all the time doing it since you knew it was going there? *EIS Team Response: The point is that we actually be able to show the work we had to go through – the analysis, and to be transparent in the document in that regard.*
- There's no money for the non-toll option today. You would have to accumulate the funds before you could do anything beyond where we are now.
- It almost seems like we need to split out another alternative to separate toll from managed lanes. Managed lanes, like the ones on the Katy Freeway that also have HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lanes, have concrete barrier costs and other things that need to be addressed. Those costs do not seem to be factored in here. There are controlled access issues; there are safety issues for EMS. When it is not managed, what other type of tolling would there be? Is it only going to be a managed lane or would it take all of the existing lanes and make them toll lanes? A lot of HOV lanes have had safety issues that do not apply if it is a non-tolled option. *EIS Team Response: The concept for the managed lane approach is that all three main lanes in each direction would be managed; there would not be separation barriers.*

So it is tolling an existing road? Managed lanes are supposed to be where they add managed lanes down the center of a road like on the Katy Freeway in Houston. *EIS Team Response: The concept for managed lanes is that there would be the ability to let certain types of vehicles travel free or at a reduced cost so it would encourage HOV travel. We need to define managed lanes better so that everyone is clear what we mean.*

- In the tolled alternatives are there free lanes? I go up there every day. We want an alternative and we do not want to be stuck in traffic. I do not want more noise, but I do want an alternative. *EIS Team Response: Under a toll or managed lane scenario you would use the frontage roads if you wanted to travel for free. In the managed lanes, two to three occupants in the vehicle could get to ride for free.*
- For people who have homes in that area you want easy access but are you also willing to pay for it? If you are willing to pay for it, I think perhaps the toll road is the best option. Therefore, people who live there have to pay for it – from the HOA (homeowners association) perspective you need to be on board to pay for it. I totally support that then.
- How are you going to monitor the managed lanes? *EIS Team Response: Typically, with cameras and gantries.*
- My taxpayers (representative of a municipality) have already paid for the road that is there and I still cannot use the toll road unless I pay more. I don't think that's right.
- I am a civil engineer and I have seen this evolution over the last 20 years where everyone is concerned that they are not going to pay for another man's stuff – but that philosophy flips the other way. I do not want to pay to fix roadways in older parts of town.
- If we choose Expressway as a tolled roadway, and then Saudi Arabia gives us \$100 billion dollars and we do not need to toll it, does Overpass/Expansion look exactly like Expressway except for the toll? *EIS Team Response: Yes, except for the toll gantries everything is exactly the same.*
- From where I'm sitting, I represent a group that thinks the fastest and most efficient way to improve travel on US 281, the better. I want other folks to understand that our priorities are different and mine is that I want to get home faster. There is no position that is right or wrong; we just have a ton of different priorities and different opinions. My group wants to get home faster.
- If we do a toll road we will be locked into that and will not be able to take advantage of new funding options. I would like to see a bullet that if you go as a toll road you are not precluded from future funding alternatives that may be developed.
- In the past, the Alamo RMA probably had a slide showing what US 281 tolled would look like that showed the existing lanes being tolled. For about a mile- and a half there were cars on the feeder road bumper-to bumper. The Encino Park people may be able to afford a toll, but would not pay for a half-mile of toll to get off at the first exit. It would definitely impact the air quality.
- I am not for tolls at all but this is a four-to-five-year process, so I think we have to preserve our methods for how to fund it, so we do not have to start all over again. I am fine with that if they can figure out how to fund the public road.

- I thought this was an EIS advisory committee. I did not think it was the “how do you fund this” committee. We have three alternatives and Elevated Expressway could be tolled or non-tolled and that is probably four. Put the relevant environmental impacts together and lay them out – and have the impact statements for all the alternatives that is what I thought this committee was about. I have my personal opinion about tolling, but I thought that was beside the point.
- In terms of cost again: there was a hard bid by Zachary in 2005 for \$26 million a mile with six main lanes and six frontage lanes up to the first three miles. If you break that out, the cost would be \$200 million for a little less than eight miles. The cost of construction has gone down significantly [since then.] How did you go from \$200 million to \$500 million? It really concerns me that the SA-BC MPO only has to come up with construction costs because TxDOT has a separate right of way cost. The Alamo RMA has to pay the right of way costs. Maybe you ought to tell us how you estimated the project with this huge a jump in costs. *EIS Team Response: In February 2011 we gave a presentation on the sources of assumptions on our cost estimates and unit costs. In the Draft EIS there will be an appendix that will include the details on how we arrived at that estimate, including all the costs. We stand by our estimate for the total project cost, not simply the construction cost being referenced from the 2005 contract.*

I would like to see a comparison with the Zachary proposal. *EIS Team Response: In 2007 the Alamo RMA had a bid for a design build contract and their bid was for \$470 million. [Note: The design / build contract was \$328 Million, but total project cost was \$470 – which included right of way, utility relocation and other related costs.]*

- When we are talking about the plans for growth, their data only takes us out to 2035 whereas the bond indebtedness goes all the way to 2063. If we have not paid them by 2035 and we need to improve the road again, how are we going to pay for it? When you talk about income factors – you are only looking at federal guidelines for low income. Affordability is a moving target as well, not just income.
- Is there any difference in air quality effects or noise impacts depending on whether people are on the main lane or the access road? Will you have a graded look at how that distribution would work? *EIS Team Response: There will be a “more graded look” at that issue – the traffic noise model will differentiate between traffic on frontage roads and on main lanes; air quality will take into consideration differences in speed on the alternatives. That distinction between the main lanes and the frontage roads will be analyzed.*
- What are the options with regard to a phased development? That may be all we can afford. Instead of nine overpasses, what if there are only five or six overpasses and then others get built later? What are the options associated with that phasing? *EIS Team Response: What we are contemplating for the Draft EIS is a conceptual phasing plan showing a logical construction plan that will be scrutinized by the Joint Lead Agencies.*

- On slide 37, when comparing the additional area of impervious cover and right of way it is the same number for Overpass/Expansion and Expressway; it is the same environmental impact from a bird's eye point of view. The cost is the same for Overpass/Expansion and Expressway. So the Environmental Impact Statement for Overpass/Expansion versus Expressway will have to focus on whether the public will pay a toll or not. *EIS Team Response: There is no one factor that determines a decision. There are a host of factors that need to be considered.*
- Where did these nine overpasses come from? Weren't there less before? *EIS Team Response: The overpass locations in the previous 2007 EA were used– I believe there were eight (Sonterra, Redland, Evans, Stone Oak, Marshall, Wilderness Oaks, Bulverde and Borgfeld). The EIS team did add an overpass at Overlook Parkway. Keep in mind this is all subject to change, we are at a very early stage in the design.*

It may be necessary to eliminate a couple of overpasses and if it inconveniences people, that's too bad.

- We have these different alternatives in the EIS and that is all we have for now. Does it give you the opportunity to take one or two overpasses out? *EIS Team Response: FHWA makes the final decision to select the alternative that can be implemented. As long as the improvements on US 281 are consistent with the selected alternative in the approved EIS and project development has been a continuous process, a re-evaluation of the EIS would not be required.*

WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

Ms. Ximenes asked the group how the presentation helped them understand the alternatives. There were three responses from CAC members:

- We need to remove the managed lane terminology since what is really being done is tolling every lane.
- I think it was helpful and clear and I appreciated the discussion.
- The flow chart with “You are here” was nice – I wish we had that since day one.

The next CAC meeting is on indirect and cumulative impacts. After that, there will be a meeting once the Draft EIS has been publically distributed. We will review the different aspects of the Draft EIS so the CAC members have a good understanding of what is included in it and discuss the upcoming public hearing format.

Ms. Ximenes thanked everyone for their participation in the discussion and the suggestions that were made. The next meeting will be in the fall some time.