

**SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS**  
IH 35 PUBLIC MEETING  
US 81 TO IH 35E/IH 35W SPLIT  
HILL COUNTY

A public meeting was held on Thursday, November 9, 2000, in the Cafeteria of Hillsboro High School in Hillsboro, Texas. This was the second public meeting for this project. The initial public meeting was held on July 6, 2000. Doors opened at 6:00 p.m. for the public to view displays prior to the meeting. Schematics showing the existing and proposed alignments and typical sections were displayed as well as the proposed construction sequencing for the project. A registration table was located near the entrance to the auditorium. Handouts included an agenda/fact sheet with a location map and a sheet for providing written comments. Thirty-five (35) private citizens and seven (7) public officials attended the meeting.

John Obr, PE, Director of the IH 35 Project Office, opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Obr introduced the public officials, TxDOT representatives and consultant team members present. He then explained the purpose of the meeting, outlined the format for the meeting and gave a brief history of the project. He said he anticipates a public hearing on the project during the early spring of 2001 to present the final schematic. David Neuman, PE, gave the technical presentation, describing the major impacts of the proposed project alignment including the possible elimination of the existing Old Hwy 77 overpass. Alisa Polansky, PE, discussed the environmental impacts, noise impacts, abatement alternatives and the environmental assessment that is in progress by Carter and Burgess.

Mr. Obr said he had received comments recently regarding the continuity of the frontage roads through the project. He explained that the project would not connect the existing frontage road system. There will only be frontage roads provided where required to allow for logical termini of connecting traffic. He then opened the meeting to public comments and questions.

A speaker asked a question regarding providing additional access to the Hillsboro Airport. He said that area was not within the limits of this project. One speaker expressed his concern about slow moving farm equipment merging with IH-35 frontage road traffic and that the public would not be expecting to encounter slow moving vehicles. Another speaker questioned the designation of "Old Highway 2". John explained that this was the original route for SH 2 many years ago. No one spoke against the project.

Mr. W.G. Orr submitted a letter with questions he wanted addressed at the meeting in the area of the IH-35 Split (See Page xx). These questions were addressed during discussions after the formal meeting. Mr. Obr then adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:20 p.m.

Two (2) written comments were received after the meeting. One (1) comment expressed support for converting a portion of the existing two-way frontage road to a one-way configuration. One (1) comment expressed concern with the discontinuity of frontage roads and the associated lack of access to sections of the surrounding area. Neither written comment required a response. No written comments against project development were received. All the comments are detailed in the Summary of Comments.

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS**  
IH 35 PUBLIC MEETING  
US 81 TO IH 35E/IH 35W SPLIT  
HILL COUNTY

**VERBAL COMMENT 1: Mr. Sam Allison**

Mr. Allison commented about the northbound entrance ramp at SH 286.

**RESPONSE 1:**

Mr. Obr said the short piece of frontage road connecting to the public road would have to remain in a two-way operation in the future to maintain access in this area.

**VERBAL COMMENT 2: Mr. Blair Russell**

Mr. Russell expressed his concern about farmers pulling farm equipment along SH 81 merging into IH-35 frontage road traffic when the traffic is not expecting to encounter slow moving vehicles.

**RESPONSE 2:**

Mr. Obr said this was a good comment.

**WRITTEN COMMENT 1: Ms. Zelda Mayo**

Ms. Mayo asked about the impacts to her property on three tracts of land in the project area

**RESPONSE 1:**

John Obr replied to her letter and informed her that the first two properties were not impacted and the third property could not be located within the area of concern for this public meeting.

**WRITTEN COMMENT 2: Mr. B.B. Messimer, Taylor Gas Processing Inc.**

Mr. Messimer was concerned about access to the new frontage road, in the northwest quadrant of US 77 and IH 35. He would prefer that the new county road be moved further to the west so that he would have property that fronts on the new frontage road. As currently shown on the schematic, Mr. Messimer's property would only have limited access to the proposed frontage road.

**RESPONSE 2:**

No response necessary.

**WRITTEN COMMENT 3: Will & Betty Lawrence**

Mr. & Mrs. Lawrence expressed concern about access to the new frontage road in the northwest quadrant of US 77 and IH 35 in the area of CR 4235. They would prefer that the new county road be shifted further west to enable them to have frontage on the new frontage road. As currently shown on the schematic, the Lawrence's property would only have limited access to the proposed frontage road.

**RESPONSE 3:**

No response necessary.