

# **Website Comments**

---

W31

**From:** Tami Merrick <tmerrick@pspaec.com>  
**To:** HOU-piowebmail@txdot.gov  
**Cc:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-01-2012 01:46 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

I am a 12 year resident of First Ward and 10 resident of Woodland Heights prior. I serve on the Board of the Avenue CDC which was responsible for acquisition of funds for construction renovation of the historic Jeff Davis Hospital located in First Ward. It was renovated into affordable housing targeting artists, musicians etc. It should be noted that there were historical graves located on this property which was one of the reasons that the community was able to attain it for public use. While I share in my concerns for the all the neighborhood interests listed below. I am particularly concerned that the Historic Value of the Old Jeff Davis as well as some of the all other historical buildings in First Ward that may or may not have markers could be located in the I-45 expansion zone. A great deal of effort has gone into preserving some of the older structures in the near downtown areas and it would seem alternative to ground expansion should not take precedence over the value of our City history and heritage. I may also note that first ward is under major change with a rapidly increasing density of residential housing that allows for residential living inside the 610 loop. This minimizes the impact of pollution associated with commuting on the air quality of Houston. Tx Dot needs to consider the quality of life for residential living within 610 loop as sustainable approach to transit. I am a proponent of the tunnel solution which allows for community connectivity and provides a more sustainable approach to transit expansion.

These are some items we want TxDOT to either comply with or agree not to do:

- **No expansion beyond the existing right-of-way on I-45**
- Alternative means of transportation must be explored
- No negative impact on the neighborhoods quality of life
- **We want a tunnel to be considered for the 4 managed lanes**
- **We want a tunnel to be considered for general traffic lanes**
- We do NOT want any new roadway built above ground level – no double decked freeways because of additional noise & visual pollution
- As an alternative – extend Hardy from 610 to downtown; widen Hardy; have TxDOT purchase Hardy and then remove all tolls. Another variation is to maintain some lanes as HOV / toll lanes and the rest for general traffic
- In addition to the above item – coordinate with Metro and extend light rail on existing rail tracks already on Hardy
- Replace and/or supplement Pierce Elevated with a tunnel system

We do not want any roadway to negatively affect water drainage into or out of our neighborhoods

Thanks

**Tami Merrick, AIA**  
Senior Associate | Design

## W32

---

**From:** kotolo@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-08-2012 12:03 PM

---

Kenneth Taylor Lindow Jr.  
kotolo@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I do not want I-45 expanded. I do not want any right of way taken; I do not want double decking. I do not want toll lanes on any highway. I believe current and future higher gas prices have and will continue to reduce traffic. I want a sound wall constructed o protect Woodland Heights from the present traffic noise as was done on 610 and in other neighborhoods. I think TexDot is not responsive to our or any other neighborhoods needs. I believe that you really dont care about our opinions. Ken Lindow 3317 Morrison (one block from the I-45 beast) 832-869-1054 832-869-1054

## W33

---

**From:** tdiddyafg@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-09-2012 09:00 PM

---

travis downs  
tdiddyafg@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

How about a better explanation of each alternative? It's very hard to understand the options without some type of 3d drawing or a better verbal explanation.

---

**W34**

**From:** work77009@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-10-2012 01:40 AM

---

Sharon Cho  
work77009@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, I like to leave comments for segment 1 of your project. Beltway 8 to IH 610. I just want to say that after coming back from the meeting today I will not support the project because all the purposed alternative build still required more right of way that everyone don't want. I live here at 4045 North fwy so I know the traffic first hand. It is not as bad as the studies said? Going northbound from 610 to beltway 8 it's a bit slow but we talking about 10 mins or so but most the time is less and after traffic passed beltway 8 and I-45 interception speed starting to pick up. So to do this big project and take away properties and you want more right of way is not acceptable. We can't afford to lose our property and job because you want to make it from 610 and I-45 north to beltway 8 faster than 10 mins which is really not necessary and we are only talking about morning and afternoon on and off work, the rest of the time is just fine. I will support utilize Hardy Toll Rd and make it where people will want to use it. I think you should focus all on how to make that work parallel with I45 instead of considering widen I45. A waste of time. To me, adding one extra lane both northbound and southbound will and should fix the traffic between 610 and I45 north all the way to beltway 8. Why the need for your alternatives of so many choices? Instead of 8 general purpose lanes why not 10? 5 northbound and 5 southbound if your intention is really to speed up and fix the traffic. Remember I live here so I know. Adding one lane on each direction will I think not require any more right of way if you just trim down those ugly bushes and grasses you should have enough land to make 5 general purpose lanes on each direction a total of 10 that should greatly help out the traffic issue. Those bushes and small patches of grasses are not really going to impact too much at all to our environment. I can put up without them if you take them and pave into a highway lane. Also, the bottleneck of the I45 northbound speed is the HOV lane exit at around Little York and Parker Drive where the traffic merges with highway. Do something about that and you will speed up traffic too. Last thing is I don't agree of more HOV or managed lanes. Why do you need them? The current HOV lane at I45 north going from 610 to beltway 8 is a joke. No one use it but Metro bus maybe and it only opens few hours of the day with one way in one way out. Few hours a day? That is a waste of lane space. No one use it because there is no good entry and exit point and is just a total failed design from the beginning, do something about that. The hope of HOV lane people will take bus from downtown to beltway 8 is just not working, Metro bus can get on highway too why give them their own lane and suffer others? We should be given that lane to use as general purpose lane. People do not like carpool so HOV lanes are mostly useless just take a look at other parts of Houston most everyone don't use it so it's not helping the congestion. Every time when traffic is slow and I could be on I45 or I10 and I am just puzzled at the near empty HOV lanes and how if they were open to traffic how much it will help indeed. Metro buses can get on highway just like everyone else and I think that is the way to go if you really just want to help the congestion and not favor with Metro. I might support 10 general purpose lanes by adding one more lanes to each side of the highway and just take the bushes and grasses land area and pave into a lane and not taking anymore right of way. You might be able to even squeeze into one more HOV lane, but I don't really agree on HOV lane at the current state anyway so two is not going to help just take up more space. All your widen I45 proposals are still leaving the highway 4 general lanes each way, so what is the point?? We are already 4 general lanes each way so why do it and only increase more HOV or managed lanes? That will not help the congestion and traffic. Fix downtown Houston area that will make southbound more smooth and ease the bottleneck that caused congestion on segment 1 and segment 2. On northbound fix the HOV exit around Little York and Parker Drive so not interfere with already running 4 general purpose lanes. As long as you want more right of way from 610 and I45 to beltway 8 I will just have to disagree with you and against it. I have been living here for about 20 years so I think I speak from experience instead of studies and statistics. Thank you for your time.

---

**W35**

**From:** matt@langrandco.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-10-2012 02:33 PM

---

Matthew Emal  
matt@langrandco.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Our family generally supports improvements to the North Houston highway system in order to reduce traffic and improve the roadway. We favor any alternative that DOES NOT EXPAND RIGHT OF WAY inside loop 610 either to I-45 or to Houston Avenue. We believe that, while tunneling is an innovative strategy, it may be too expensive an alternative to be reasonable, and if tunneling is done under residences along Houston Avenue, it be done without disruption to residents and without expanded ROW on Houston Avenue. We do not oppose the addition of managed lanes to I-45, and prefer dedicated lanes in each direction instead of reversible lanes as we believe this approach has worked well on I-10 West. However, our preference would be for whatever alternative expands roadway capacity WHILE REMAINING WITHIN THE EXISTING ROW OF I-45 North inside loop 610. Lastly, we would favor the demolition of the North St. bridge over I-45 between Houston Avenue and North Main St. Through traffic on North Street over this bridge is very often at dangerously high rates of speed for drivers trying to avoid intersections at North Main to the north and Quitman to the south. In addition, large trucks frequently use this bridge against posted prohibitions, often damaging trees and vehicles along the roadway. We believe the elimination of through traffic on North St. would improve the quality of life to residents with minimal disruption to area mobility.

---

**W36**

**From:** Beau3015@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-10-2012 04:50 PM

---

Beth Fischer  
Beau3015@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

In general, I oppose the idea of improving this section of I-45. As someone who does not commute on it everyday I don't see the need to spend all this time and money, pour more concrete and disrupt commuters and residents so people can get to work a few minutes faster. Having said that, I know something will be done about widening I-45 no matter what my opinion is, so I would like to provide these comments. I am strongly opposed to widening I-45 south of Loop 610 into downtown. I am a homeowner on Morrison St located two blocks west of I-45 in the historic Woodland Heights neighborhood. I do not want the freeway frontage road to be any closer than it already is. A freeway this close to my house will affect my property value, will create more noise and traffic, and will affect my quality of life overall. In addition, Woodland Park, one of Houston's oldest historic parks is located directly west of I-45 just north of its intersection with I-10. I am on the board of the neighborhood group who is actively working to revitalize this beautiful neighborhood park. Widening the freeway in this area would be disastrous to the aesthetics of the park and it's natural wildlife and plants. Woodland Park is currently on the Upper Texas Coast migratory bird path. I support a tunnel system entering downtown (not under Houston Ave.) that would provide for a surface level greenspace area. The greenspace could connect from Woodland Park northeast to Moody Park. This greenspace area could also include and protect Hollywood Cemetery. I also support the expansion and upgrade of the Hardy Toll Road south of Loop 610 to downtown. The existing toll road is fully functional and could be extended southward using the existing Hardy Road and Elysian Street rights of way. The Hardy Toll Road ROW also has potential for the use of passenger rail lines. Thank you for reading my comments.

---

**W37**

**From:** [md\\_mendoza1215@yahoo.com](mailto:md_mendoza1215@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [comments@ih45northandmore.com](mailto:comments@ih45northandmore.com)  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-10-2012 05:05 PM

---

Maria Mendoza  
md\_mendoza1215@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = True

Last nights meeting gave me a little relief knowing that segment 2(cavalcade to quitman) will not be affected as much as I thought we would be. I do hope the project team puts into consideration about all the noise, air pollution and traffic that segment 2 will get with the expansion of the lanes. At the meeting last night I was also informed about the other option that would take up less land on ground, which would be elevating the lanes up higher over the lanes that already exist. I think that would be better because the land space that is there wont be messed with as much as well as the homes and businesses that are already there. I also do not agree with "add tunnel to existing". Project team be considerate about this option, when it rains how it will affect with major flooding. Houston has too much concrete, not enough land.

---

**W38**

**From:** donna@wbifinancial.com  
**To:** [comments@ih45northandmore.com](mailto:comments@ih45northandmore.com)  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-10-2012 11:23 PM

---

Donna Beene  
donna@wbifinancial.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I know this won't be popular, but...don't allow tractor trailers on the majors roads during peak travel time. I drive from Conroe via HTR or I45 to Allen Parkway 5 days a week in traffic both ways,and I have observed a vast difference in the traffic depending on whether large trucks are on the road. They require so much more time and space when dealing with stop and go traffic causing a huge accordion effect. This won't eliminate the traffic, but it will keep things moving more smoothly.

---

**W39**

**From:** [quotes@studentmovers.net](mailto:quotes@studentmovers.net)  
**To:** [comments@ih45northandmore.com](mailto:comments@ih45northandmore.com)  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-11-2012 02:29 PM

---

Richard Latter  
quotes@studentmovers.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I own a building along the I-45 corridor which I rent. This project would virtually make my building worthless. My tenants are already talking about leaving and want to find a new location

---

**W40**

**From:** [dbb@hbl-architects.com](mailto:dbb@hbl-architects.com)  
**To:** [comments@ih45northandmore.com](mailto:comments@ih45northandmore.com)  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-11-2012 03:43 PM

---

Daniel B. Barnum  
dbb@hbl-architects.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I was at the meeting at Jeff Davis High School; thank you for having it. I think I-45 definitely needs to be remodeled to handle more traffic, and I favor the following options (but see the caveat at the end): Segment 1 - Alternatives 7 or 8, mainly because the others would be horribly destructive to businesses and therefore expensive. If there were an option to do away with frontage roads, I would be very much for that. Segment 2 - Alternate 10 This is the only one that seems remotely reasonable, especially if you take lessons from the Central Expressway in Dallas concerning aesthetics. (Houston's freeways, with some exceptions, are incredibly ugly, and they don't have to be that way.) Although the idea of tunneling sounds wonderful, the cost just seems to me to be out of reason. Segment 3 - Alternative 10 Again, this is the only one that seems to me to be even remotely reasonable. A one way loop would be confusing and time consuming; tunneling is too expensive. However, in each segment, I think Alternate 2 (TSM) is probably the best alternative. As Houston gets more and better public transit, the need for enlarged freeways/tollways will decrease, and 20 years from now we might end up with wide strips of unused concrete traversing the city. In the paper today there is an article about how smart phones will "replace" cars in five years. Not sure that will happen, but certainly working from home will dramatically increase in that time frame. If the state would increase the gas tax by 50 cents per gallon - which it ought to do - transit ridership would explode and I-45 use would severely diminish. That would make all the widening being pursued here rather pointless. I would really like to see some of this kind of outside-the-box thinking, but the engineers and contractors hate it.

---

**W41**

**From:** wendy@tidermanrealestate.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-12-2012 05:13 PM

---

Wendy Parker  
wendy@tidermanrealestate.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Can you please post the ROW aerial photos that were displayed at the I-45 Scope meeting yesterday and Tuesday? I'd like to take a closer look at the boundaries. thanks!!

---

**W42**

**From:** jimnirmi@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-13-2012 02:56 PM

---

J.E. Willcockson  
jimnirmi@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: prefer Alternatives 1 (Hardy connector) and 7 (Elevated central structure for managed lanes) Segment 2: prefer Alternatives 11 (Elevated central structure for managed lanes) and 15 (Hardy connector) Segment 3: prefer Alternatives 3 (one-way downtown loop) and 10 (8 general purpose lanes). Do NOT tunnel under downtown Houston.

---

**W43**

**From:** Paula.Lenz@north-houston.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-15-2012 02:59 PM

---

Paula Lenz  
Paula.Lenz@north-houston.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

The North Houston Association supports the North Highway Improvement Project, which is evaluating alternatives for improvements to IH 45 from downtown to Beltway 8, and other segments as well. This section is listed on the top 100 most congested roadways in Texas, and the association supports finding potential means to alleviate that congestion. The congestion and ensuing accidents impact IH 45 all the way into Montgomery County along the IH 45 corridor.



---

**W44**

**From:** tmerrick@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-15-2012 06:35 PM

---

Tami Merrick  
tmerrick@pspaec.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I attended the first scoping session and just went through the online documents for the registration and I signed in at the door but do not see my sign in sheet on this website?

---

**W45**

**From:** hguerrero2001@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-18-2012 10:33 PM

---

hugo guerrero  
hguerrero2001@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

please consider the increase in noise level near the Pierce elevated. i live at the 2016 main bldg along with over 500 other residents. the noise level in our balcony, directly associated with the Pierce elevated, is in excess of 110 dB. If traffic increases on this highway we will no doubt have an increase in this noise. we have to find times of the day where traffic is at it lowest in order to try and enjoy our balcony; noise level drops to an average of 95 at these times. the quality of life for our bldg will be greatly impacted with additional traffic. im sure im speaking for the other residents here, we would rather see a tunnel built to manage the additional traffic. this tunnel i believe might even lower our problematic noise level. thanks for listening to the public. soot is also a problem that can be fixed if the tunnel is built. please continue to consider and analyse the incredible benefits. thx

---

**W46**

**From:** tmerrick@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-19-2012 03:12 PM

---

Tami Merrick  
tmerrick@pspaec.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

The third town hall meeting is not clearly listed on the website! Please add this data to the website.

---

**W47**

**From:** trevi83500@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-19-2012 07:26 PM

---

Jose Angel Trevino  
trevi83500@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Don't take this offensively but common sense will tell you if you make the highways bigger with more lanes. In a few years that will be filled and you will back to taking peoples homes, land or businesses for an ongoing problem. Why not look into the rail system on the highways. So that people can preserve money, time and help the ecosystem. If people want to drive alone in a vehicle of any size than let them suffer in traffic and not reward them. They can have a vehicle and drive it on the weekend or days off or when they want too. But going to and from work just to park it all day and then drive home to get dress to go out is crazy. Let's not reward them.

---

**W48**

**From:** Michelle8140@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-22-2012 01:12 PM

---

Jose pina  
Michelle8140@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Will the homes be bought out that are located along side the feeder of the proposed i45 expansion? My home is located at 257 west riverwood drive.

---

**W49**

**From:** Robert.Maxwell@jacobs.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-24-2012 08:53 AM

---

Robert A. Maxwell, P.E.  
Robert.Maxwell@jacobs.com  
Employed = False  
Business = True  
Benefit = False

These comments are for the 2nd Scoping Meeting. It was a success. The information presented was clearly presented with well considered alternatives. My only concern for this corridor relates directly to a current and ongoing study being performed by the TxDOT Rail Division via Federal Railroad Administration HSIPR Grant Funding (\$15 million). The grant application included high level review of three corridors to be considered for the HSIPR EIS: 1) BNSF Tracks from Houston to Dallas (Teague Subdivision, through Tomball) 2) UPRR Tracks from Houston to Dallas (Navasota Subdivision, along US 290 to College Station); 3) a greenfield alignment along IH 45 from Urban Core to Urban Core. Option 3 includes IH 45 from downtown Houston to Greenspoint yet the alternatives do not address the needs of this overlapping study. The HGAC is also studying routes into downtown for passenger trains to get to the "preferred intermodal site" known as the US Post Office in downtown. It is located at the southeast corner of I-45 and I-10. It would seem to be a good use of limited resources to include a footprint for the HSIPR particularly since an alternative includes elevated managed lanes in varying locations. The HSIPR trackway could be elevated as well. I hope that these two studies are coordinated in the future. Thank you, Robert A. Maxwell, P.E.

---

**W50**

**From:** kyle.baier@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-24-2012 11:36 AM

---

Kyle Baier  
kyle.baier@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

After viewing the 2nd scoping meeting documents, here are my thoughts: Segment 1: 4, 5 and 6 are all the same plan, which is the one I think is best. Pros: Grabbing row while it's still (relatively) cheap because this won't be the last time 45 get's a makeover, Con: Need sidewalks and/or bike paths. Mobility is for everyone, not just people in cars. Segment 2: I'm really liking Alternative 10, sunken urban freeways are the way to go, also I like the shared use lane, although I would prefer an actual bike lane on the right side (preferably seperated via barrier). Again, I would like sidewalks on the final plan. Segment 3: The best by far is Alternative 7. Surface freeways should be about getting people to and from downtown, through traffic in a tunnel is the way to avoid congestion.

---

**W51**

**From:** peggyprecinct1@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-25-2012 09:23 AM

---

Peggy Lindow  
peggyprecinct1@sbcglobal.net Business = False  
Section 2: Prefer Alternative 12 as first choice. Alternative 10 as second choice

---

**W52**

**From:** jaymiem@ymail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-25-2012 01:35 PM

---

Jaymie Mielke  
jaymiem@ymail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am in favor of alternative 4 in segment 3 and I oppose alternatives 5 & 7 in segment 3.

---

**W53**

**From:** mikeator2@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-25-2012 01:56 PM

---

Mike Ator  
mikeator2@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Regarding the I-45 Universe of Alternatives: Alternatives 5 & 7 of segment 3 would make a huge negative impact on both residents and businesses. Alternative 4 would be less of a burden.

---

**W54**

**From:** jcrobertson@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-25-2012 04:33 PM

---

John C Robertson  
jcrobertson@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I favor alternative 4 in segment 3. I particularly strongly oppose alternatives 5 and 7 of segment 3, as these alternatives would greatly impact the areas surrounding the spur.

---

**W55**

**From:** kevillew@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-25-2012 06:55 PM

---

Keville Ware  
kevillew@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I support Alternative 4 in Segment 3. I especially oppose Alternatives 5 and 7.

---

**W56**

**From:** spreston@nadgus.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-25-2012 09:42 PM

---

Northline Commons / Stephen Preston  
spreston@nadgus.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

The ownership of Northline Commons strongly opposes condemnation or taking of any kind. Northline Commons is a 480,000 square foot class A, newly constructed, regional power and lifestyle shopping center located at the northeast corner of IH-45 and Cross Timbers. Northline Commons remains the ONLY major retail destination servicing the vast trade area. Anchored by multiple and essential national, regional and local retailers, service providers and restaurants, condemnation or taking of any kind would materially adversely impact the shopping center, community and its residents in a variety of ways. Irrespective of the immediate, costly and destructive effect any taking would have on the OVERALL function, form, use and economic viability of the shopping center, the hardship placed on its thousands of daily shoppers that rely on its proximity and accessibility given the scarcity of nearby similar shopping options is equally harmful. The following, and in no particular order of importance, are a just a few of the adverse impacts: • Parking • Access • Tax revenue • Aesthetics • Visibility • Layout, vehicular flow • Construction / re-construction cost • Loss of entitlement(s) value • Lease-ability / market-ability • Economic valuation impact • Sale-ability / Finance-ability • Lease violation / cancel-ability • Pedestrian issues

---

**W57**

**From:** PDILIP@HOTMAIL.COM  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-26-2012 02:53 PM

---

DILIP  
PDILIP@HOTMAIL.COM  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I HAVE OWNED PROPERTIES ON I45 FOR ALMOST 26 YEARS AND I WOULD HATE TO LOOSE ANY OF MY PROPERTIES(IT'S MY LIVELIHOOD). I DO OPPOSE ANY OF THE CONSTRUCTION WHICH WOULD TAKE AWAY MY PROPERTIES. I THINK HARDY ROAD EXPANSION SEEMS TO BE VERY GOOD AND VIABLE OPTION(ECONOMICALLY AND ENVIRONMENTALLY) AND MORE EASLIY MANAGEABLE.

---

**W58**

**From:** RWBAPGEON@YAHOO.COM  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-26-2012 05:35 PM

---

RANDY WALTERS  
RWBAPGEON@YAHOO.COM  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I WILL LOSE MY JOB AT BAP-GEON IF YOU WIDEN INTERSATE 45

---

**W59**

**From:** work77009@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-27-2012 01:21 AM

---

Peter Cho  
work77009@aol.com

After the meeting with TxDOT coordinated by I-45 Coalition I am still not 100% sure of all the alternatives. I think on segment 1 Hardy Toll Road will be more doable and not to kill too much business properties along I-45, people need their jobs and you shouldn't even consider widen it at all. If segment 1 alternatives 7 or 8 with elevated managed lanes can be fit under existing ROW then they are worthy of mention otherwise no, taking more ROW even just a little on alternatives 7 or 8 will hurt too much for business on segment 1. On segment 2 I think tunnels are only so-so idea same as the elevated double decker but whatever you choose just same as segment 1 it must not take anymore ROW and hurt property owners. For both segment 1 and 2, I think elevated or tunnel ideas will have only limited exits and lacking the convenient of exiting freeway at places people want just like the HOV lane right now will only impact and benefit minimal. I think you should leave the I-45 the way it is to serve the community needs and focus more on making Hardy Toll Road work parallel with I-45. On segment 3 one-way-loop is just a terrible idea. I think tunnels might be the only way but again must consider residents ROW, no one likes to lose their home or business. Lastly, why don't you make this comment section as a blog or forum type? Where people can post what they think and you have someone regularly monitor to supplement any info or answer questions people have? If it's too late for 2nd scoping meeting then consider it for future meetings from now on. An open blog/forum where people can post comments and anyone can see and comment on it can have more interactions from both TxDOT and concerned citizens.

---

**W60**

**From:** jwbeck11@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-30-2012 01:20 PM

---

Jason Beck  
jwbeck11@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I believe that every possible effort should be made to explore a tunnel / tunnels option at the very least in the downtown area. I like the idea of also adding a tunnel to connect the 59 spur to 45. This would keep the budding integrity of midtown while adding more capacity. If we are really looking into radical ideas on the freeways surrounding downtown, I would also like to submit the idea of widening & covering the 59 trench east of downtown and adding a park over the covered area. This would be something similar to what Dallas has done by connecting the Uptown region to downtown. This also could be extended all the way down to teh 288 / 59 exchange in the future. I'd like to again stress the tunnel option for 45 near downtown (at least). The ideal option in my book would have tunnels under the current construction of 45 from 610 (hopefully the 45 - 610 exchange can be reworked). What 45 is now, can be changed to something of a limited access boulevard like memorial parkway with access points to the tunnels. The parkway would intigrated into the downtown street system like memorial as well. The tunnels would follow the route of 45 under downtown and hopefully tie into the 59 spur. I really like the idea of piggy-backing HOV / managed lanes onto the Hardy toll road and adding direct 45-HArdy connectors @ 610 and Beltway 8. The ease of transition will vastly increase the usage of the road. In addition to Hardy, TXDot needs to explore adding free HOV access to all HCTRA toll roads during rush hour. This would definately incentivise carpooling throught the region and better dilute traffic on congested 'free'ways. The cost and scope of this work will be vast. I don't think there is a cheap and easy option. I think with the size of the pricetag, one should explore benefits like additional park space, covered trenches (a cheaper version of a tunnel), elevated freeway removal to tap into additional revenue sources. Is there federal \$ to be had for building more parks? Carbon credits? What about selling right of way on TXDOT land?

---

**W61**

**From:** copacopa77@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-30-2012 07:29 PM

---

M. Williams  
copacopa77@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear TXDoT, please tunnel I-45 through downtown and as far north as possible. The city needs to reconnect to downtown and this is THE way to do it. Thank you, M Williams

---

**W62**

**From:** holcomb.elizabeth@bp.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 11:57 AM

---

Elizabeth Fairchild  
holcomb.elizabeth@bp.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hi, Is the project stating there will be a potential interstate running down Houston avenue?

---

**W63**

**From:** nickersondave@mac.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 12:40 PM

---

Dave Nickerson  
nickersondave@mac.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am totally against widening 45 in Segment 2. I would support elevated HOT lanes, but in no way support widening 45. I would also support charging tolls to penalize single driver cars.

---

**W64**

**From:** tdowns@dow.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 02:54 PM

---

Travis Downs  
tdowns@dow.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hi, so when is the actual ground breaking projected to take place? I live in the woodland heights area and I'm curious. Ballpark timeline? Thanks and have a great day



---

**W65**

**From:** jeff@newliving.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 05:16 PM

---

Jeff  
jeff@newliving.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please consider tunneling I-45 through downtown. Midtown, Montrose, and the Heights will once again be connected to our downtown. Without connection, downtown will continue to feel disconnected from the rest of the city.

---

**W66**

**From:** adam@urbandeal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 05:20 PM

---

Adam B  
adam@urbandeal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

It is vitally important to the long-term health and growth of the city to tunnel I-45 through downtown. Remove the Pierce Elevated and the city will once again be connected. Thank you, AB

---

**W67**

**From:** adp3a@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 07:39 PM

---

Andrew P  
adp3a@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, Please tunnel I-45 through downtown Houston. It will positively impact the entire city and make downtown a more accessible place in which to travel, live, and work. All the best, Andrew

---

**W68**

**From:** Frances\_DiStefano@anntaylor.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 07:47 PM

---

Frances DiStefano  
Frances\_DiStefano@anntaylor.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear Txdot, It is my pleasure to provide a comment on this important issue. I no longer live in Houston, but believe that opening downtown to the western neighborhoods by tunneling I-45 will make a world of difference for Houston. I believe this is a critical issue that will change the way in which Houston is perceived by its residents, visitors, and other cities. Houston, please do the right thing and tunnel this enormous freeway as Boston has done with its Central Artery/Tunnel Project. Boston's downtown is now so much more pleasant and approachable. Houston could be even better! Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Frances DiStefano

---

**W69**

**From:** lisa@greenplatekids.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 07:51 PM

---

Lisa Pounds  
lisa@greenplatekids.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

TXDOT, I like any scenario where I-45 is submerged below grade or tunneled through downtown and to the north. It would make a ton of sense to tunnel the freeway and add a parkway on top, therefore adding lanes to the overall ROW. Thank you, Lisa Pounds

---

**W70**

**From:** boberry@netzero.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-31-2012 08:04 PM

---

Jon Derry  
boberry@netzero.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

For segment 2, I would prefer alternative 14. Alt. 10 would be my second choice. I would be against anything that is elevated because of the noise. Also it would be nice if noise walls were built prior to construction on the freeway to minimize noise to the residential areas. For segment 3, I like alt. 3 and 7. Thanks.

---

**W71**

**From:** daniel@sybaritepig.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-31-2012 08:11 PM

---

Daniel SB  
daniel@sybaritepig.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please submerge I-45 through downtown to 610 North.

---

**W72**

**From:** jacopast@mac.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 10-31-2012 08:25 PM

---

Sunghwan Yoon  
jacopast@mac.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear TxDot, What an incredible opportunity to FINALLY connect downtown to the rest of the city (at least, the western side). If I-45 is tunneled or submerged from the southernmost study area all the way to the north past the Heights, downtown will once again thrive as a neighborhood IN the city, not separated from it, the way it is now. Please consider this approach to the new freeway. Plus, a parkway could be built atop a submerged freeway. It would add lanes and slower traffic to the right-of-way. Thank you, Sunghwan Yoon

---

**W73**

**From:** ayham@avrdesignstudio.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 10-31-2012 08:40 PM

---

Ayham Victor  
ayham@avrdesignstudio.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I-45 needs to be lowered beneath grade. Buffalo Bayou should once again flow into downtown without the deafening sound of cars overhead.

---

**W74**

**From:** rolvega34@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-01-2012 09:53 AM

---

Roland Vega  
rolvega34@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = True

I was told that if I didn't comment on this project. I would be risking my job. As for me I like to see improvements on the freeway that would be less traffic going outbound and inbound on i45. So I agree with the project!

---

**W75**

**From:** kounthear@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-01-2012 01:33 PM

---

Kk  
kounthear@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, Please tunnel I-45 through downtown and the Heights! Thanks, K K

---

**W76**

**From:** George@kutnerian.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-01-2012 04:49 PM

---

GK  
George@kutnerian.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To Whom it May Concern, Please consider tunneling I-45 through Downtown and the Heights area. It will vastly improve access to downtown from its neighboring neighborhoods. Thank you

---

**W77**

**From:** kevin.oleary@tariki.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-01-2012 04:50 PM

---

KEVIN O'LEARY  
kevin.oleary@tariki.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

TUNNEL I-45!

---

**W78**

**From:** halder\_avijit@yahoo.co.in  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-01-2012 04:55 PM

---

Avijit Halder  
halder\_avijit@yahoo.co.in  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear NHHIP, Please consider tunneling I-45 under as much of the right-of-way as possible. Downtown desperately needs to be re-linked with the rest of the city and this is THE opportunity to do just that. Also, if you tunnel the freeway, consider repurposing the existing freeway interchanges that run through downtown. They could be Houston's version of the High Line: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High\\_Line\\_%28New\\_York\\_City%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_Line_%28New_York_City%29) All the best, Avi

---

**W79**

**From:** hjlandin@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-01-2012 04:58 PM

---

H Landin  
hjlandin@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Put the freeway underground!

---

**W80**

**From:** aj@forsitestudio.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-01-2012 05:01 PM

---

AJ  
aj@forsitestudio.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dig a hole and put it underground. It'll make Houston a much more inviting city. I may even move back! ;)

---

**W81**

**From:** brett-richards@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-01-2012 05:06 PM

---

Brett Richards  
brett-richards@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear North Houston, please tunnel I-45! Thank you, Brett

---

**W82**

**From:** karenjoseph@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-01-2012 05:07 PM

---

KAREN J  
karenjoseph@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Tunnel it! Tunnel it! Tunnel it!

---

**W83**

**From:** jack@fulcrumprop.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-02-2012 01:03 AM

---

Jack H  
jack@fulcrumprop.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please consider tunneling I-45 under downtown Houston and the Heights. The city needs it!

---

**W84**

**From:** JerryMarshall@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-02-2012 01:07 AM

---

Jerry Marshall  
JerryMarshall@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please, North Houston Highway Improvement Project, consider tunneling I-45, if at all possible. Thank you, Jerry Marshall

---

**W85**

**From:** frankrose2@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-02-2012 01:12 AM

---

Frank R  
frankrose2@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

My comments center around the tunneling of I-45 through downtown. We all want Houston to become a more livable city. Removing the fast traffic that cuts off downtown from the rest of the city will do incredible things for this city. Please tunnel I-45! thank you so much! Frank

---

**W86**

**From:** cruth@publicstorage.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-02-2012 06:56 PM

---

Carolynn Ruth for Public Storage  
cruth@publicstorage.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Public Storage owns two properties in Houston that could be affected the North Houston Highway Improvement Project I-45: one at 9030 North Freeway and one at 9811 North Freeway. Public Storage would oppose any project that would require the acquisition of land from either property. However, if the project goes forward and additional right-of-way must be acquired, Public Storage would prefer that all additional right-of-way be taken from the east side of the highway, and that no additional right-of-way be acquired from the west side of the highway. Thank you. Carolynn Ruth Real Estate Paralegal Public Storage 701 Western Avenue Glendale, CA 91201-2349 Tel: 818.244.8080 818.244.8080 x1410 Fax: 818.548.9288 Email: [cruth@publicstorage.com](mailto:cruth@publicstorage.com)



---

**W87**

**From:** lanagordonlaw@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-02-2012 11:48 PM

---

Lana Gordon  
lanagordonlaw@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money spent on managed toll lanes. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 In Favor: Alternate 3 & 3C – the least amount of additional ROW is required. Managed toll lanes on existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternate 7 – less ROW required – BUT TxDOT must provide method for noise abatement on all elevated structures and feeder roads to reduce increased noise levels with landscaping. Alternate 8 - less ROW required – Provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increase noise levels with landscaping. Oppose: Alternates: 4, 5 or 6 because they all require 150' in additional ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 In Favor: Alternate 15 - no additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy. Provide sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes to neighborhoods with landscaping. This is also the extension of Hardy expansion in Segment 1. Alternate 14 - no additional right of way along I-45. This allows for tunnel into downtown Segment 3. Alternate 10 – no additional right of way with depressed lanes w/ concrete beams covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and Near North Side. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 In Favor: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Oppose: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W88**

**From:** Terry1981@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-03-2012 11:47 AM

---

T Smith  
Terry1981@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please consider tunneling the freeway. Houston desperately needs it and bayou-goers won't be assaulted by traffic noise as they enter downtown. Thank you!

---

**W89**

**From:** Greg.Robertson@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-03-2012 11:59 AM

---

Gregory Robertson  
Greg.Robertson@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To Whom it May Concern: This is an incredible time for Houston. Please consider removing the Pierce Elevated while tunneling the freeway through downtown. Motorists will likely be less distracted as they pass through downtown at high speeds, thus leading to fewer accidents. Residents will enjoy a more peaceful entryway to downtown. There will be less pollution at the gateway to our signature downtown. Please tunnel the freeway!! Sincerely, Gregory Robertson

---

**W90**

**From:** tammy1982@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 01:24 AM

---

Tammy Eggleston  
tammy1982@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, please consider tunneling the freeway (I-45) and removing the Pierce Elevated. As Houstonians, we need this. Thank you,  
Tammy E

---

**W91**

**From:** Jeffreyliddle@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 07:09 AM

---

Jeff Liddle  
Jeffreyliddle@hotmail.com

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W92**

**From:** Nick.Riviera2012@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 07:38 AM

---

Nick Riviera  
Nick.Riviera2012@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Your evaluation of alternatives is not intellectually honest or rigorous. By anyone's reasonable evaluation, the No Build scenario comes out the clear winner. For both the cost and ease of implementation metrics the No Build scenario gets an "A+". Average those scores and it moves close to the top. Be honest with yourselves about the other ratings with a lense of this wasting \$2B of taxpayer money, and the no build alternative wins. It's clear the "n/a" ratings were selectively used to move No Build to the bottom and ensure a new concept was selected. While I agree the congestion is terrible, adding an average of a few miles an hour to mainlanes at a cost of \$2B is ridiculous. Leave the highway alone and let people use the Hardy expansion if saving some time is worth it to them. Don't make those of us in town pay for people to commute from the woodlands.

---

**W93**

**From:** julie.villaescusa@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 07:54 AM

---

Julie Villaescusa  
julie.villaescusa@gmail.com

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W94**

**From:** herbs@hal-pc.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 08:11 AM

---

Ann Herbage  
herbs@hal-pc.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

## W95

**From:** stacie.hohmann@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 08:50 AM

---

Stacie Hohmann  
stacie.hohmann@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

## W96

**From:** mmastal@insightspr.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 08:59 AM

---

Megan Mastal  
mmastal@insightspr.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W97**

**From:** garrett.hohmann@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 09:26 AM

---

Garrett Hohmann  
garrett.hohmann@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W98**

**From:** ficlark@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 10:14 AM

---

Florence Clark  
ficlark@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W99**

**From:** I@frogpad.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 10:26 AM

---

linda marroquin  
I@frogpad.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money spent on managed toll lanes. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 In Favor: Alternate 3 & 3C – the least amount of additional ROW is required. Managed toll lanes on existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternate 7 – less ROW required – BUT TxDOT must provide method for noise abatement on all elevated structures and feeder roads to reduce increased noise levels with landscaping. Alternate 8 - less ROW required – Provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increase noise levels with landscaping. Oppose: Alternates: 4, 5 or 6 because they all require 150' in additional ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 In Favor: Alternate 15 - no additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy. Provide sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes to neighborhoods with landscaping. This is also the extension of Hardy expansion in Segment 1. Alternate 14 - no additional right of way along I-45. This allows for tunnel into downtown Segment 3. Alternate 10 – no additional right of way with depressed lanes w/ concrete beams covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and Near North Side. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 In Favor: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Oppose: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W100**

**From:** fred@lindnerdesign.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 11:19 AM

---

Fred Lindner  
fred@lindnerdesign.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am strongly opposed to any plan that calls for adding any new above grade structures, i.e. "double decker" freeways. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 10 & 14. I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to Alternatives 11, 12, & 13. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 & 6 TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 5, 7 & 10. I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to Alt 8. Thanks.

---

**W101**

**From:** jrbonica@bonica.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 11:23 AM

---

John R. Bonica  
jrbonica@bonica.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money for an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a waste of money. TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates its traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W102**

**From:** judy.bonica@ferguson.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 11:24 AM

---

Judy Crain Bonica  
judy.bonica@ferguson.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money for an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a waste of money. TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates its traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.



---

**W103**

**From:** coyia.richter@aglife.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 11:29 AM

---

Coyia Richter  
coyia.richter@aglife.com

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money spent on managed toll lanes. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 IN FAVOR: Alternate 3 & 3C – the least amount of additional ROW is required. Managed toll lanes on existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternate 7 – less ROW required – BUT TxDOT must provide method for noise abatement on all elevated structures and feeder roads to reduce increased noise levels with landscaping. Alternate 8 - less ROW required – Provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increase noise levels with landscaping. Oppose: Alternates: 4, 5 or 6 because they all require 150' in additional ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 IN FAVOR: Alternate 15 - no additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy. Provide sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes to neighborhoods with landscaping. This is also the extension of Hardy expansion in Segment 1. Alternate 14 - no additional right of way along I-45. This allows for tunnel into downtown Segment 3. Alternate 10 – no additional right of way with depressed lanes w/ concrete beams covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and Near North Side. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 IN FAVOR: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Oppose: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W104**

**From:** mcgaryj@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 11:44 AM

---

John McGary  
mcgaryj@sbcglobal.net

IN FAVOR: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose.

---

**W105**

**From:** Boatstorage@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 12:14 PM

---

Dan McMillan Boatstorage@att.net

Use hardy remove tolls have acces from hardy to I 10 west and I10 east and down town

---

**W106**

**From:** sgreene@wm.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 12:14 PM

---

Stuart Greene  
sgreene@wm.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hi, I live right next to the I-45 North southbound lanes, on Parkview St. My big concerns are 1) losing my property and 2) worsening the sound. I see from your proposal materials the you are not considering expanding beyond the current right of way, and I am grateful for that. I am very worried about a couple of the proposals which show an elevated HOV lane - depending on the height of the elevation, this could end up towering over my house and yard. I would however support any proposal that results in the freeway being entirely shielded by the height of a typical soundwall. Thanks, Stu Greene

---

**W107**

**From:** jaker@azphoto.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 12:15 PM

---

Joe Aker  
jaker@azphoto.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W108**

**From:** Hguerrero2001@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 12:27 PM

---

Hugo Guerrero  
Hguerrero2001@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W109**

**From:** Yvonne\_pacheco2006@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 12:30 PM

---

Yvonne Pacheco  
Yvonne\_pacheco2006@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W110**

**From:** tara@asakurarobinson.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 01:10 PM

---

Tara Mather  
tara@asakurarobinson.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W111**

**From:** slalom\_75@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 01:43 PM

---

Scott Johnson  
slalom\_75@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I oppose the project overall, on the basis that the traffic study at 12 years old is out of date, and because the projected improvement in traffic flow is not worth the cost or the neighborhood disruption. If the project proceeds in any form, then my comments are: Segment 1: Approve Alternates 3, 3C, 7, and 8; Oppose Alternates 4, 5, and 6. Segment 2: Approve Alternates 10, 14, and 15. Segment 3: Approve Alternates 4, 5 and 6; Oppose Alternates 3, 7 and 10.

---

**W112**

**From:** heatherheathmcintyre@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 02:09 PM

---

Heather McIntyre  
heatherheathmcintyre@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear Sir or Madam: I am against the expansion of I-45 or any work thereon to improve speeds by only 3 mph. It is a waste of time, money and construction frustration for almost no benefit. My first choice is to do nothing. However, if TxDOT insists on going forward, my comments are as follows. Whatever is done, please limit increasing ROW and encroaching into neighborhoods. Additionally, please limit access to neighborhoods (ie we do not need a bunch of big intersections allowing traffic into neighborhoods). More particularly: I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Thank you, Heather McIntyre

---

**W113**

**From:** maryl@avenuecdc.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 02:34 PM

---

Mary Lawler  
maryl@avenuecdc.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W114**

**From:** blake.r.masters@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 12:52 PM

---

Blake R. Masters  
blake.r.masters@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11, and 12. The residential communities along this segment do not want the increased noise or pollution associated with any of the elevated structure alternatives nor does the 100+ year-old bungalow community want the physical blight of sound walls along the feeder roads. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W115**

**From:** smstrawn@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 12:53 PM

---

Sabrina Strawn  
smstrawn@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I'm opposed to this project since we will be spending billions, slowing traffic during construction, then gaining only 3 mph increase in speed once all is done. In addition, the traffic study is outdated. For segment 1, I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8 with the following caveat. Noise abatement on all elevated structures must be added to Alternatives 7 & 8. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW. For segment 2, I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12. I'm very concerned about the effect on the eastern edge of my neighborhood. For segment 3, I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Thank you.

---

**W116**

**From:** mindbodyhealing@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 03:13 PM

---

Nancy Kern  
mindbodyhealing@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

As a 30 year resident of the Woodland Heights and 3rd generation Houstonian, I care deeply about quality of life in the inner city. I am opposed to any changes to I-45 that will increase the already disturbingly loud freeway noise and poor air quality that disturbs my sleep and makes enjoying being outdoors more difficult. I am opposed to spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes. Not only is it a HUGE waste of money, research shows that the improvement in travel time is only temporary. I understand that TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000. How can that data reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today? I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. ANY approaches that result in noise abatement and better air quality is at the top of my acceptable list. I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12. I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W117**

**From:** Anpache18@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 03:30 PM

---

Andrea Pacheco  
Anpache18@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W118**

**From:** kurt@ecclesiahouston.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 04:30 PM

---

Kurt Kopczynski  
kurt@ecclesiahouston.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, I work at the church that is located just to the west of I-45 at 1100 Elder Street. Obviously, we oppose any expansion plans that will infringe on our property or facility. Please contact me if you'd like to meet in person to discuss further! Thank you. I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W119**

**From:** roblock713@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 05:31 PM

---

Robinson Block  
robblock713@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am soon to be a home owner in the Northside and am concerned about I-45 expansion. I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.



---

**W120**

**From:** tmerrick@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 05:47 PM

---

Tami Merrick  
tmerrick@pspaec.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Although I oppose the expansion, I want to note the federal government has spoken in favor of using sustainable practice in highway design. I would like Tx Dot has done to provide comprehensive data on what practices it will implement in this project to provide sustainability and green practices. The scoping session didn't address sustainability. It also was lacking in a clear understanding of how segments connect and what impact ramps etc. would have on each alternate.

---

**W121**

**From:** slynch@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 06:14 PM

---

Sandra Lynch  
slynch@pspaec.com

I oppose the expansion of I-45. There needs to be more study (cost/benefit, livability issues, air quality, sustainability) and more input from the affected homeowners and businesses. We should be looking at ways to get more people off the highways and into carpools, highspeed rail and rapid buses.

---

**W122**

**From:** barryshatswell@comcast.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 06:29 PM

---

Barry Shatswell  
barryshatswell@comcast.net

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W123**

**From:** janie.garza@juno.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 07:20 PM

---

Janie Garza  
janie.garza@juno.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I do not feel that making this stretch of road wider is going to make a difference in traffic at all - do some professional repairs to the highway to avoid the accidents - accidents occur due to extremely bad highway. Entrance and exits need help - not widening- why destroy so many businesses and give them pennies on the dollar for thier properties? There are already many out of business due to the rail which seems to be endless contruction and no rail. All these projects and hurting Houston residents not helping at all - our money badly being spent with no results. Learn from Mexico I have seen entire roads built in months - no interruption in traffic and full metro rail fully functional in months!!!!!!!!!!!!No one losing property either. Check it out. You could learn a thing or two.

---

**W124**

**From:** pccowboy@swbell.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-05-2012 07:43 PM

---

Mike Vance  
pccowboy@swbell.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I very strongly oppose anything that takes additional right of way. I oppose the expansion. Our city has already suffered from enough concrete blight. Another consideration is that taking homes and businesses, especially in historic areas is unnecessary and costly in all ways. I favor Alternate 10 for segment 2, if that expansion takes place. Alternate 14 is also acceptable. Tunneling is much preferred over above ground alternates which would add noise and blight. Please take the neighborhoods into consideration. We care about quality of life! The rights of the inner city should not be trampled by those who chose to move to the suburbs.

---

**W125**

**From:** hbibliow@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 10:22 PM

---

Hana Bibliowicz  
hbibliow@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I do not want any expansion of I-45 in our neighborhood. it will destroy the few green wooded areas, trees and historic housing. It is mnot needed. The money would be better spend in public transportation. I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W126**

**From:** donnaeperkins@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 10:25 PM

---

donna perrkins  
donnaeperkins@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. I'm in favor of more rail.

---

**W127**

**From:** Manuelhj54@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-05-2012 10:41 PM

---

Manuel H Jimenez  
Manuelhj54@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

First of I want say that I'm sorry to inform that I am opposing to freeway expansion for a couple of reasons. Let me start of by one, there is a couple of historic buildings around that area. Second, I have a couple friend that might lose their homes due to the fact that they are right in the middle of the expansion. Third, I work right down the street from that area and there is times that I take a route right thru there. The last reason is that many businesses that are starting to rise in that area might be shut down and leave people that work in. Those businesses might lose their jobs. Honestly my opinion might not mean much but I used to live in that area and I would hate to see it be transformed in a highway.

---

**W128**

**From:** earthalter@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 07:26 AM

---

Lydia Henn  
earthalter@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W129**

**From:** mechlemjr@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 08:51 AM

---

Jeff Mechlem  
mechlemjr@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I oppose the 1-45 expansion

---

**W130**

**From:** mmm.1960@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 09:18 AM

---

Melanie Martinez  
mmm.1960@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W131**

**From:** scotte9461@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 10:02 AM

---

Scott Epps  
scotte9461@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W132**

**From:** sean.filipow@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 10:12 AM

---

Sean Filipow  
sean.filipow@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, I am a resident who lives near the intersection of Houston Ave. and Spring St. As such, I am concerned about the possible impacts felt on my neighborhood from proposed changes. In addition, as a long time Houston resident, I am concerned on the overall impact, as well. I think that spending billions of dollars of taxpayer's money to get what will likely be a marginal improvement in general traffic lanes is a waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending any money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and our beloved small businesses. Segment 1: I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12. Segment 3: I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Thank you for your attention and time. Regards, Sean Filipow

---

**W133**

**From:** christie@rathmannassociates.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 10:33 AM

---

Christie Samson  
christie@rathmannassociates.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7, 8 & 10.

---

**W134**

**From:** mekressman@mac.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 11:00 AM

---

Monica Kressman  
mekressman@mac.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money spent on managed toll lanes. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 IN FAVOR: Alternate 3 & 3C – the least amount of additional ROW is required. Managed toll lanes on existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternate 7 – less ROW required – BUT TxDOT must provide method for noise abatement on all elevated structures and feeder roads to reduce increased noise levels with landscaping. Alternate 8 - less ROW required – Provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increase noise levels with landscaping. I AM OPPOSED: Alternates: 4, 5 or 6 because they all require 150' in additional ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 IN FAVOR: Alternate 15 - no additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy. Provide sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes to neighborhoods with landscaping. This is also the extension of Hardy expansion in Segment 1. Alternate 14 - no additional right of way along I-45. This allows for tunnel into downtown Segment 3. Alternate 10 – no additional right of way with depressed lanes w/ concrete beams covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and Near North Side. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 IN FAVOR: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. I AM OPPOSED: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W135**

**From:** dwv88@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-06-2012 12:48 PM

---

Doug Villaescusa  
dwv88@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am FOR Segment 1 : Alternative 1, 3&3c. I am FOR Segment 2 : Alternative 1, 15 I am FOR Segment 3 : Alternative 1, 4. I am against ALL other Alternatives for all three Segments.

---

**W136**

**From:** jeff.hooge@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-06-2012 02:33 PM

---

Jeff Hooge  
jeff.hooge@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.



---

**W137**

**From:** germantownhd@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 02:50 PM

---

Wendy Parker  
germantownhd@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

TxDOT: We appreciate the time spent with the owners of properties affected by the I-45 project. In my opinion, I think it's prudent for TxDOT to update their 12 year old traffic studies to represent current traffic data in order to make a more informed decision about expanding/changing I-45. The previous data stated that you would be spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes. If this data is accurate, then this project is a HUGE waste of taxpayer (my) money. I am against ANYONE spending ANY money until you update your traffic studies and determine cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT ignores that request and proceeds, then the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10 (noise abatement MUST be part of this alternative). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Thank you for your attention to our opinions and requests, as we live 4 houses from I-45 and are directly affected by whatever is chosen...

---

**W138**

**From:** jshowalt@houstonisd.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 03:17 PM

---

Jamie Showalter  
jshowalt@houstonisd.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W139**

**From:** lthomas@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-06-2012 03:37 PM

---

Larry Thomas  
lthomas@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To Whom It May Concern: Please remove the Pierce Elevated and tunnel the freeway underground. Downtown and Midtown desperately need this!

---

**W140**

**From:** jjr1112@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-06-2012 03:40 PM

---

Julian Arezpo  
jjr1112@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please remove the horrible freeway from around downtown and the Heights. If you put it underground, it will be much easier to visit downtown. As of now, it is always difficult and intimidating to cross the freeway into the "walled city."

---

**W141**

**From:** levinson.francis@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-06-2012 03:43 PM

---

Francis Levinson  
levinson.francis@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear friends in high places, One of the most significant ways to improve Houston would be to remove the freeway overpasses that cut off downtown from the rest of the city. Your proposal to trench or tunnel the freeway is outstanding! I strongly urge you to make it happen! Thank you, F Levinson

---

**W142**

**From:** aaron.r.steichen@exxonmobil.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 04:51 PM

---

Aaron Steichen  
aaron.r.steichen@exxonmobil.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10 (We like Alternative 10 ONLY if TxDOT converts this new surface area into usable green space and/or park land). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W143**

**From:** rhurst@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-06-2012 08:24 PM

---

Randolph L Hurst  
rhurst@pspaec.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 In Favor: Alternate 3 & 3C – the least amount of additional ROW is required. Managed toll lanes on existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternate 7 – less ROW required – BUT TxDOT must provide method for noise abatement on all elevated structures and feeder roads to reduce increased noise levels with landscaping. Alternate 8 - less ROW required – Provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increase noise levels with landscaping. I am opposed: Alternates: 4, 5 or 6 because they all require 150' in additional ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 In Favor: Alternate 15 - no additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy. Provide sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes to neighborhoods with landscaping. This is also the extension of Hardy expansion in Segment 1. Alternate 14 - no additional right of way along I-45. This allows for tunnel into downtown Segment 3. Alternate 10 – no additional right of way with depressed lanes w/ concrete beams covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and Near North Side. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 In Favor: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. I am opposed: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W144**

**From:** cecil.gammill@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-06-2012 11:01 PM

---

cecil gammill  
cecil.gammill@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I support Options 3 , 3c, and 4 for segment 1 . I do not support any plan for TxDOT to take any ROW from the east side of I 45 between Airline Dr. and Parker Rd.

---

**W145**

**From:** khg80@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 10:19 AM

---

Kristen W.  
khg80@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am AGAINST expanding I-45. I live in the urban core of Houston and do not want I-45 to be expanded within the inner limits of Beltway 8. Do not tunnel under Houston Avenue.

---

**W146**

**From:** quiroz21@comcast.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 10:58 AM

---

A Quiroz  
quiroz21@comcast.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W147**

**From:** mdorn@trinitydt.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 11:25 AM

---

Rev. Michael Dorn  
mdorn@trinitydt.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Greetings: I recently became aware of the deadline for comment on proposed alternatives for the I-45 corridor. I am specifically concerned about Segment 3 (Downtown Loop System) and Alternative Numbers 7 or 8 and any discussion that would impact Houston Avenue at Washington. I am the Senior Pastor at Trinity Lutheran Church. We have nine acres of property and 100,000 square feet of facilities in downtown Houston that boarder on Houston Avenue. The church has over 1,700 members and our school serves over 300 children. The church was established in 1879 and we have been at our current location since 1903. We have ministries that serve the people in our community and the homeless. As there is potential for the I-45 alternatives to affect us and the people we serve, I would like to have input into these discussions. Please contact me on my cell at 832-752-5886 or via email at morn@trinitydt.org. Thank you!

---

**W148**

**From:** sralph@dharmacafehouston.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 11:50 AM

---

Susan Ralph  
sralph@dharmacafehouston.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

The first ward has worked hard to develop business in the area and promote the clean up of the neighborhood. This would destroy businesses that have invested in this neighborhood.

## W149

**From:** tmerrick@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 11:59 AM

---

Tami Merrick  
tmerrick@pspaec.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I oppose the expansion project for all alternates presented in every segment. The cost of \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a waste. I am also opposed to TX Dot building managed toll lanes with private funds from companies that will be holding our roads hostage to taxpayers in the future. This project should be paid for with bonds which would allow profits in years to come to be put into metro for real mass transit like commuter trains and Bus Rapid Transit that would not promote more air and noise pollution. The private funding for toll roads in houston needs to stop!!!

---

## W150

**From:** julialovett@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 12:46 PM

---

Julia Lovett  
julialovett@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Tunnel the freeway! Please consider tunneling I-45, or, at least, placing it below grade. Then, PLEASE remove the Pierce Elevated! It is an eyesore, a homeless magnet, and a divider between downtown and midtown. Thank you, Julia

---

## W151

**From:** slp1980@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 01:04 PM

---

Selma Peterson  
slp1980@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please consider removing the Pierce Elevated and dropping I-45 below grade. But, maybe consider a High Line-like approach with the spaghetti bowl of freeway overpasses above Buffalo Bayou. If you integrate them into the Buffalo and White Oak Bayou park plans - plant them and make them into hike and bike trails - Houston will be even more an envy of the country. Go Houston! Thank you, Selma Peterson

---

**W152**

**From:** adeyler@cs.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 01:09 PM

---

Alan Eyler  
adeyler@cs.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Thanks for reviewing the details of the options at the review meeting on Oct 24th. It was very helpful. And thanks for the opportunity to comment. Here are my thoughts. In general, I would rather see the \$2-4B that this will cost spent on mass transit that is so badly needed in Houston. Barring that choice, I prefer the following options by segment: Segment 1 -- option 3(Hardy expansion) or 8 (elevated w/in current ROW). This minimizes the consumption of additional land for roads. Segment 2 -- Option 15 seems like the right choice if Option 3 is used for Segment 1. Option 14 (tunnel) starting outside 610 and tied in with Segment 3 tunnel(s) is my next choice. Secondly, I would prefer Option 10 although it does not seem applicable to the entire distance of the segment and it is unclear what would be used on the northern stretch. I would definitely recommend Option 10 be worked in conjunction with the City Parks Dept to create a covered green belt. Segment 3 -- Options 5&6, but not Option 7 as I have reservations about the tunnel under Houston Avenue that it implies.

---

**W153**

**From:** atabatabai3@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 02:45 PM

---

syed ali tabatabai  
atabatabai3@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

My name is syed ali tabatabai.I own northtown service center 5610 north freeway.I wish to say im in favor of alternatives 3 and 4 for segment one of your proposed project.I have been at this location for 33 years.I currently employ 6 full time employees,as well as numerous other people during the year.Also on the same property I have a home for disabled people who currently number 36.Due to the configuration of my property and my very close proximity to the north freeway feeder I simply, can not afford to lose any frontage.For me to lose any property will deal my buisness a disabling blow if not fatal.I support my family with this business and the families of my employees.This is all we have please do not take it from us. respectfully yours syed ali tabatabai northtown service center 5610 northfreeway 77076 713 699 2894

---

**W154**

**From:** rraimond@comcast.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 03:38 PM

---

Randy Raimond  
rraimond@comcast.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Suggested comments: I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1 and Segment 2: Eliminate the current HOV lanes and replace with two HOV diamond lanes. This adds an additional lane and the two lanes will be greater utilized than the current HOV multi-directional lane. This is a very cost effective solution that TxDOT has not considered. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W155**

**From:** razorbacks1212@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 04:02 PM

---

Tamela Jones  
razorbacks1212@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, please consider reconfiguring the new I-45 so that it is below grade and the Pierce Elevated is removed. It would also be nice if I-45 were sunk underground through the neighborhoods north of downtown. Reconnecting those neighborhoods would add vitality to downtown and help Houston, in general. As for the freeways on the western portion of downtown. One option would be to remove them all; the other would be to keep the infrastructure and actually landscape them to be used as park space. Take a look at some of the raised parks across the country, like the high line in NYC. A park there would be INCREDIBLE for the Heights and Montrose and the entire city, in general! Thank you, Tammy



---

**W156**

**From:** prr59@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 04:06 PM

---

Paul Rodriguez  
prr59@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear North Houston, This is an incredible opportunity for the city to reconnect. Removal of the ugly concrete Pierce Elevated would open Midtown like never before. Tunneling the new I-45 would make such an impact on the city and how its used and perceived. Please consider the residents that live close to these massive freeways and their health and tunnel the freeway!

---

**W157**

**From:** janice.martinez18@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 04:22 PM

---

Janice Martinez  
janice.martinez18@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1 and Segment 2: Eliminate the current HOV lanes and replace with two HOV diamond lanes. This adds an additional lane and the two lanes will be greater utilized than the current HOV multi-directional lane. This is a very cost effective solution that TxDOT has not considered. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W158**

**From:** ryan@solarcity.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 04:26 PM

---

Ryan Hazen  
ryan@solarcity.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am a resident of Houston's First Ward. I Strongly Oppose Segment 3 Alternative 8. An elevated highway through the Historic First Ward neighborhood would destroy the character of the neighborhood, devalue properties, negatively impact local business, attract homeless people, inundate the neighborhood with noise and air pollution, ruin views of downtown, and generally ruin our quality of life.

---

**W159**

**From:** ryan@solarcity.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 04:29 PM

---

Ryan Hazen  
ryan@solarcity.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am strongly opposed to Section 3 Alternative 3. Creating a one-way loop around downtown Houston is idiotic and serves no purpose. We would be better served spending this money on better public transportation alternatives.

---

**W160**

**From:** dolson@olsonllp.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 05:40 PM

---

David W. Olson  
dolson@olsonllp.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear Project Team, I am a First Ward resident and would prefer that the Team explore alternatives to expanding Interstate 45. I did attend one public meeting on the matter; however, due to work schedule, have not been able to fully participate in the process. The First Ward, Heights and the Near North neighborhoods are a few of Houston's historic areas. Anything the team can do to limit the taking of these unique and restoring areas would be greatly appreciated. Thanks for your time. David W. Olson and Kaela P. Olson (residents at 1520 Spring Street)

---

**W161**

**From:** bodenlm@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 06:17 PM

---

Laura Bodenheimer  
bodenlm@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Spending more than \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a big waste of money spent on managed toll lanes. Why is TxDOT using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. You can understand why I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates its traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds against the will of citizens who will be most affected, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 IN FAVOR: Alternate 3 & 3C – the least amount of additional ROW is required. Managed toll lanes on existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternate 7 – less ROW required – BUT TxDOT must provide method for noise abatement on all elevated structures and feeder roads to reduce increased noise levels with landscaping. Alternate 8 - less ROW required – Provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increase noise levels with landscaping. I AM OPPOSED: Alternates: 4, 5 or 6 because they all require 150' in additional ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 IN FAVOR: Alternate 15 - no additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy. Provide sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes to neighborhoods with landscaping. This is also the extension of Hardy expansion in Segment 1. Alternate 14 - no additional right of way along I-45. This allows for tunnel into downtown Segment 3. Alternate 10 – no additional right of way with depressed lanes w/ concrete beams covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and Near North Side. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 IN FAVOR: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. I AM OPPOSED: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W162**

**From:** maryjaneb@gmx.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 06:28 PM

---

Mary Jane Buschlen  
maryjaneb@gmx.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I-45 Expansion Comments I have reviewed your alternate suggestions for this expansion project and am in favor of the following: Alternate 3 & 3C for Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 Alternate 10 for Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 Alternate 6 for Segment 3: I-45 through Downtown Pierce Elev 59

---

**W163**

**From:** Julyous3@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 06:40 PM

---

Julio Calle  
Julyous3@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

my name is Julio Calle and I own Premium Atoplex located at 5330 North Freeway. I want to express that we want alternatives 3 or 4 for segment 1 north freeway project. This will affect my family and my 3 employees income.

---

**W164**

**From:** bnwautorepair@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 06:42 PM

---

Nery Hernandez  
bnwautorepair@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

my name is Nery Hernandez and I own BNW Autorepair located at 5346 1/2 North Freeway. I want to express that we want alternatives 3 or 4 for segment 1 north freeway project. This will affect my family and my 12 employees income. we have been here for over 18yrs.

---

**W165**

**From:** 1stophouston@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-07-2012 06:43 PM

---

Miriam Calle  
1stophouston@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

my name is Miriam Calle and I own 1stop multiservice located at 5324 North Freeway #130. I want to express that we want alternatives 3 or 4 for segment 1 north freeway project. This will affect my family and my 3 employees income.

---

**W166**

**From:** holcomb.elizabeth@bp.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 08:11 PM

---

Elizabeth Fairchild  
holcomb.elizabeth@bp.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To whom this may concern: Thank you for considering new improvements to our roadway. Although I am in favor of increasing efficiency for our transportation, I am against spending money on the current suggestions. Is it possible for TxDOT to update its traffic studies and determine more cost-effective solutions? Should this request be ignored, I am in favor of the following for Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45) I AM IN FAVOR of Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods) I AM IN FAVOR of Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Again, please consider conducting a new study. This area in particular has greatly improved. Homes have been remodeled, rebuilt. There is a strong arts district. There are proposed bike paths underway that will run down Houston avenue. To put a freeway in the middle of these historic areas, would ruin the bustling, cultural city we all want to see. Thank you for your consideration, Elizabeth Fairchild 291 509 4062

---

**W167**

**From:** bikin7@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 10:22 PM

---

James mackey  
bikin7@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: 3, 7 & 8 are okay. I see no real need for the direct connector along the Beltway. Addressing the flooding and drainage issues near Tidwell is a must. Segment 2: I support a combination of 10 and 14. I oppose the direct connector proposal along 610. Work should include removing the culverted sections of Little White Oak Bayou. Segment 3: I support further study on the tunnel concept at this point.

---

**W168**

**From:** Kelley@kelleydevine.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-07-2012 10:31 PM

---

Kelley Devine  
Kelley@kelleydevine.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money spent on managed toll lanes. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods:

---

**W169**

**From:** vaharrison@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 07:57 AM

---

Victoria Harrison  
vaharrison@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I live at 729 Rutland, in one of the oldest 23 homes in the Houston Heights. Our house was begun in 1897 by Sam Blackman, a blacksmith. I am concerned that I45 expansion would impact the neighborhood. I cannot decipher the map on line. Can you advise me about the impact on this part of Houston Heights? I sincerely request consideration for the historic and community quality of this neighborhood. Thank you.

---

**W170**

**From:** vaharrison@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 08:06 AM

---

Victoria Harrison  
vaharrison@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear Public Officials, I've consulted to more knowledgeable neighbors and community representatives and now want to add my comments to many you will receive. Thank you for taking these concerns into account as you make decisions. I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

Segment 1 We are in favor of Alt. 3 & 3c = This alternative adds 2 additional lanes on Hardy and requires only 14' additional feet right-of-way (ROW). Alt. 3c adds 4 elevated managed lanes on 2 structures on Beltway 8, 2 in each direction and requires an additional 100' ROW - 50' from each direction. Alt. 7 - Adds 4 managed lanes on one elevated structure in middle of I-45 and increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 60' of ROW - 30' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. Alt. 8 - Adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerlines. Increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 50' of ROW - 25' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. We oppose Alt. 4, 5 or 6 because all of these require 150' additional ROW - either all from the West or from the East or 75' split over both East & West. Segment 2 We are in favor of Alt. 15 = On 610 to Elysian/Hardy, this adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerline with no increase of ROW. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes including landscaping. On Hardy, it will require an additional 24' ROW and provide 2 additional lanes; 1 inbound & 1 outbound. Alt. 14 - No additional ROW required on I-45. Existing roadway stays the same and a bored tunnel is added to carry 4 managed lanes within the I-45 ROW. Alt. 10 - No additional ROW required on I-45. The roadway that is below grade level is widened to include 4 managed lanes while staying within ROW. The roadway below grade level is covered with concrete beams for a solid surface at grade level. Includes two 15' outside bike lanes. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT converts this new surface area into usable green space and/or park land. We oppose Alt. 11 & 12 because these both require elevated structures for the managed lanes which will increase noise and sight pollution. Segment 3 We are in favor of Alt. 4 = No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes from an extension of Elysian/Hardy at the North, goes under La Branch and Crawford and terminates at the US 59/SH 288 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to I-45. Alt. 5 - No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Bagby and terminates at Spur 527. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT moves the tunnel further away from Historic Districts Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. We also want an exit to I-45. Alt. 6 - No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Jefferson and terminates at I-45 south of the I-45/US 59 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to US 59. We oppose Alt. 3 - converting Pierce Elevated and part of US 59 and I-10 into the world's largest round-a-bout would be a waste of time & fuel and would drive excess amounts of traffic to surface roads and neighborhoods. We oppose Alt. 7 - we do not want any tunnel going under or thru historic neighborhoods including Houston Avenue.

---

**W171**

**From:** sheerenfamily@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 08:28 AM

---

Bonnie Sheeren  
sheerenfamily@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

We moved to the Heights almost 20 years ago. We did so that we would not have to commute in from far away. We would love for more people to join us, but if the quality of life goes down because a large freeway goes through parts of our neighborhood, I don't think there is much of a chance for this part of Houston to grow and flourish. I have heard that there will only be an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against any expansion until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines more efficient solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.



---

**W172**

**From:** Annasundrud@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 08:51 AM

---

Anna Sundrud Trang  
Annasundrud@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Support our Neighborhoods from I-45 Expansion by commenting to TX Dot by Nov. 9th Dear Neighbors, TxDOT has plans for I-45, which will impact you as a resident or business owner near the I-45 Corridor in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, Near North Side, Montrose, Midtown and Downtown. Public Comment Deadline is Friday November 9th. You can go to this link for complete maps of each segment and summary at [http://ih45northandmore.com/scoping\\_documents2.aspx](http://ih45northandmore.com/scoping_documents2.aspx). Coalition met on November 1st and decided to oppose the expansion but selected alternates that are preferred for least impact to our neighborhoods and business as noted below. The I-45 Coalition needs your input. We must tell TxDOT what we want and don't want, or TxDOT will do what THEY want! Consider to comment online and Oppose the IH-45 expansion- consider to agree with the coalition's selected alternates for our neighborhoods! Copy below and paste directly to TXDOT on line link below and please add your own viewpoints about the expansion. Volume of response counts!!! Comment as often as you like and please forward to others! <http://ih45northandmore.com/email.aspx> I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money spent on managed toll lanes. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 IN FAVOR: Alternate 3 & 3C – the least amount of additional ROW is required. Managed toll lanes on existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternate 7 – less ROW required – BUT TxDOT must provide method for noise abatement on all elevated structures and feeder roads to reduce increased noise levels with landscaping. Alternate 8 - less ROW required – Provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increase noise levels with landscaping. I AM OPPOSED: Alternates: 4, 5 or 6 because they all require 150' in additional ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 IN FAVOR: Alternate 15 - no additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy. Provide sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes to neighborhoods with landscaping. This is also the extension of Hardy expansion in Segment 1. Alternate 14 - no additional right of way along I-45. This allows for tunnel into downtown Segment 3. Alternate 10 – no additional right of way with depressed lanes w/ concrete beams covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and Near North Side. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 IN FAVOR: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. I AM OPPOSED: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W173**

**From:** delliotgriffith@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 08:53 AM

---

Debra Elliott Griffith  
delliotgriffith@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

Z

---

**W174**

**From:** madsteinart@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 09:20 AM

---

Madilyn Stein  
madsteinart@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I AM OPPOSED: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods. There better ways to improve traffic flow and a better way to use our money. I live in

---

**W175**

**From:** blake.masters@montiebeach.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 09:25 AM

---

Blake R. Masters  
blake.masters@montiebeach.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please do not expand the right of way in Segment 2. When I-45 was originally constructed, the Brooke Smith neighborhood lost approximately 16 square blocks to that project. (See the stretch of I-45 between Coronado and Cottage Streets.) When there are acceptable alternatives for expansion on the table that do not expand the right of way and that the community largely supports, I would find it simply appalling for anyone to entertain the notion of taking more from my community. As it stands now, the new larger interchange for I-45 and I-610 (the yellow circles on your TxDOT maps) already puts several of our northern residents at risk. The impact to my neighborhood should be minimized as much as possible. An expansion of the main lanes into the Brooke Smith neighborhood again would be simply unacceptable.

---

**W176**

**From:** margarethd@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 09:35 AM

---

Margaret Dower  
margarethd@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am a resident of Woodland Heights. I oppose any widening, flyovers, or anything that alters the footprint of I-45 past my neighborhood. I will not support anything that diminishes my neighborhood to accommodate commuters. To relieve traffic congestion, make I-45 a toll road. Consider a tunnel. We cannot "pave" our way out of traffic.

---

**W177**

**From:** maryhayslip@me.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 09:49 AM

---

Mary Hayslip  
maryhayslip@me.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W178**

**From:** brookejharris@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 10:13 AM

---

Brooke Harris  
brookejharris@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W179**

**From:** kengal@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 10:25 AM

---

Sonal Damani  
kengal@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W180**

**From:** trevi83500@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 10:37 AM

---

Jose Angel Trevino  
trevi83500@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

First why leave a comment if the comment is left on death ears. Corporations and government offices do not listen to anyone who is not rich and can contribute millions into their pipe dream. Second my comments have been left here many times but here it goes again. Making the highways wider will only bring more pollution, more traffic and more accidents. Why put people health and life at risk. A rail system down the center of I-45, 59 and I-10 will bring people from 1960, beltway 8 and farther much easier, less costly and much safer. People will have a chance to relax, do some work or anything they want to before getting to work. Instead of sitting in traffic regardless of how wide you decide to build the highways. It will be a waste of money but what is government good for if not to waste our money and make the rich RICHER!!!! Of course not everyone would ride a train. But let them decide to sit in traffic and not reward them for moving far and working downtown. Also the rail system will take people both directions all day long not just benefiting the outsiders crying they can't downtown fast.

---

**W181**

**From:** elocin\_selyorb@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 11:22 AM

---

Nicole Broyles  
elocin\_selyorb@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W182**

**From:** almondpye@msn.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 11:30 AM

---

Anna Almond  
almondpye@msn.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Waste of taxpayer \$ to spend \$2BIL for 3mph! Don't destroy our inner city neighborhoods & businesses for commuters! 45-610: YES 3/3c. NO 4,5,6. 610-I10: YES 15,14,10; NO 3,11,12. 45-59: YES 4 w/exit to 45; NO 3 NO roundabout. Update studies!

---

**W183**

**From:** aprilsears333@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 11:33 AM

---

April Sears  
aprilsears333@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W184**

**From:** mail@codyrisner.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 12:09 PM

---

Cody Risner  
mail@codyrisner.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am against the expansion. The traffic caused and the money spent will not benefit the current users of this highway! It is also encroaching and destroying historical neighborhoods. With the influx of people from other US cities where public transit is highly used, I am starting to see this trend picking up here and changing the way Houstonians will commute in the future.

---

**W185**

**From:** lyric1011@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 12:18 PM

---

Julie Hauptman  
lyric1011@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayers money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to todays congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150 of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W186**

**From:** lms5315@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 12:19 PM

---

Louise Smith  
lms5315@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayers money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to todays congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150 of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.



---

**W187**

**From:** rc.reyna@greaternorthside.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 12:37 PM

---

Rebecca Reyna  
rc.reyna@greaternorthside.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

On behalf of Greater Northside Management District, the Board of Directors, and staff, we strongly urge Texas Department of Transportation to consider the viability and the amount of current investment businesses have committed to the Northside area, before making decisions that would affect such businesses. We are against any plan that would hinder these viable businesses.

---

**W188**

**From:** mike.prochaska@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 12:55 PM

---

Mike Prochaska  
mike.prochaska@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Tunneling is a ridiculous idea and would be ridiculously expensive (think Boston's BIG DIG). I am for adding elevated lanes above the existing lanes of I45 (NOT WIDENING). The 1-way loop around downtown is a silly idea that would increase gas consumption and move traffic to surface streets. I am for the solutions that fit the above comments WITHOUT CAUSING MORE TAXES ON ME AND MY FAMILY. I am for anything above that does not negatively affect my home value, as I live close to Houston Avenue in The Heights. I think of this as a pork-barrel project - people should carpool or just deal with the traffic. I pay more for my real estate to live closer to downtown specifically to avoid traffic.

---

**W189**

**From:** schroljd@wellsfargo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 01:11 PM

---

Jay Schroller  
schroljd@wellsfargo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am a resident of the area that may be impacted by the proposed I-45 North Expansion/Reconstruction Segment 3. I wanted to voice my opinion prior to the close of public input on this project. I support the recommendations of the I-45 Coalition. As relates to Segment 3, I can support the following: Alternative 4 – with an exit added to move traffic to I-45 Alternative 5 – with avoidance of Avondale West, Audubon Place and First Montrose Commons plus add an exit that would move traffic to I-45 Alternative 6 – with an exit that would move traffic to Hwy-59 I do not support the other Alternatives proposed for Segment 3. Other solutions should be explored to relieve the traffic problems in this area including the new light rail line going in so close to I-45 North (along North Main and Fulton). The Segment 3 neighborhood is a growing area with many new residents settling with many long term residents. This area's proximity to Downtown Houston and the Washington Corridor should be allowed to continue to develop with as little as possible interference from the proposed expansion of I-45. All historic properties, public areas and parks within this neighborhood should remain and be preserved. Thanks.

---

**W190**

**From:** rtaylor@rightturnmarketing.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 01:23 PM

---

Richard Taylor  
rtaylor@rightturnmarketing.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W191**

**From:** jostlind@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 02:09 PM

---

Jennifer Ostlind  
jostlind@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I'm opposed to the acquisition of additional ROW inside Loop 610. The harm to established inner loop communities, park space and public amenities far outweighs the benefits of additional capacity. More funds need to be spent encouraging carpooling and transit ridership as Houston's population increases. Tax dollars should not go towards programs/infrastructure that encourages development in the far suburbs.

---

**W192**

**From:** donna.f.bennett@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 02:09 PM

---

Donna Bennett  
donna.f.bennett@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W193**

**From:** lauretta.harrison@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 02:21 PM

---

Laura Harrison  
lauretta.harrison@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I believe that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W194**

**From:** mike.margle@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 02:32 PM

---

Michael Margle  
mike.margle@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To whom it may concern: As a resident of the First Ward Arts District, I'm disappointed to see that some of the proposals include major changes to the up-and-coming area around Houston Avenue. I think that bringing a major traffic thoroughfare through the area is a terrible idea if you want the neighborhood to grow up and be a great urban living area. It would be inappropriate to sacrifice the urban neighborhoods for the sake of commuters. Any options to alleviate congestion on the highways should address the root cause of the traffic congestion, and look to incentivize more efficient use of existing highway assets. The disruption of a neighborhood should give all involved parties cause for concern. Best regards,

---

**W195**

**From:** judy.benavides@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 03:13 PM

---

Judy Benavides  
judy.benavides@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1 and Segment 2: Eliminate the current HOV lanes and replace with two HOV diamond lanes. This adds an additional lane and the two lanes will be greater utilized than the current HOV multi-directional lane. This is a very cost effective solution that TxDOT has not considered. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W196**

**From:** jpmuscara@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 03:42 PM

---

Joe Muscara  
jpmuscara@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W197**

**From:** rdvoretzky@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 04:25 PM

---

Rachel Dvoretzky  
rdvoretzky@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

In the 21st century, mobility projects should put the protection, health and safety of existing neighborhoods first and above all other considerations. Thoughtful, innovative design should follow these parameters, and cost should be balanced against them. I believe that TxDOT engineers can rise to these challenges to bring best solutions to the North Houston Highway Improvement Project, solving mobility problems while preserving neighborhoods and giving Houston a point of pride instead of another city's worth of concrete, noise, air pollution, health problems, and lowered property values. I also believe that spending over \$2 billion of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is an unconscionable waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using 12-year-old traffic data that does not reflect current traffic patterns, and cannot be considered as valid as more recent figures for prognostication purposes. I am therefore against spending any money until TxDOT updates traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to current and future patterns. However, if TxDOT proceeds, I believe that the following alternatives are the best for minimizing acquisition of additional right-of-way (ROW) and protecting the fabric, health and wealth of neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 For Segment 1: I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7, and 8 under the following conditions: With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 As a resident, parent, property owner and active citizen in this segment I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 10 & 14. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12. I particularly like Alt. 10 ONLY if TxDOT converts this new, decked surface area into usable green space and/or park land. With this alternative I would like to see the entire stretch of 45 between 610 and North Main depressed and covered with the decking, to create a continuous expanse of usable parkway and green park space with noise and air pollution managed and filtered. Managed in conjunction with existing cultural and recreational organizations, this park area could offer programming and activities that would turn a blight into an asset to the entire north side and a boost to property values and neighborhood reputation. TxDOT designers and engineers could be truly proud of it, too. Alternative Segment 3: I-45 through Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Sincerely, Rachel Dvoretzky 404 Cordell St Houston 77009

---

**W198**

**From:** sarafer13@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 05:19 PM

---

Sara Fernandez  
sarafer13@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TXDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TXDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 through Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add an exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W199**

**From:** joenoton15@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 05:28 PM

---

Joseph Norton  
joenoton15@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am only commenting on Section 2 because that is where I live. TxDOT has told us in writing that there is no right of way expansion planned between Quitman and Cavalcade except for major intersections, so my opinion assumes no R.O.W. expansion between Quitman and Cavalcade. If that changes, my opinion will also change. My primary concern is noise abatement. Not only noise abatement for the added noise that will be created when building one of the alternatives, but also noise reduction from the level it is at currently. Therefore, I propose that regardless of the alternative, a noise study be done and noise abatement structures (noise reduction berms and/or walls) be installed in all residential sections of segment 2. Of the 6 selected preliminary alternatives for segment 2 (Alternatives 3, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15), here are my thoughts. Alternative 3 OK: Adds an additional main lane in both directions, but the manage lanes would need to alternate direction depending on time of day. That's OK with me, but it seems a little awkward and difficult to manage. Alternative 10 OK "plus": A good alternative; especially if the new overhead surface area is converted into usable green space/parks (as discussed in the meetings). This alternative also adds bike lanes which is a great idea. Alternatives 11 & 12 NOT OK: Both require elevated structures for the managed lanes which will likely cause more noise, so I do not like those alternatives. Alternative 14 OK Conditionally: This is the tunnel under the existing I-45. Seems expensive, but if that alternative is chosen, I would only be in favor of it if TxDOT would still add the noise reduction berms and or walls to the existing I45 segment 2. Alternative 15 OK Conditionally: This is route managed traffic to Hardy alternative. Seems expensive, but if that alternative is chosen, I would only be in favor of it if TxDOT would still add the noise reduction berms and or walls to the existing I-45 segment 2.

---

**W200**

**From:** rutledgepat@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 05:51 PM

---

Patrick W. Rutledge  
rutledgepat@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Regarding the section of I-45 between 610 North and I-10, my wife and I are strongly opposed to any expansion that increases the current roadway footprint at all. We also object strongly to any elevated lanes in addition to those that already exist. We are in favor of expansion only if it includes tunnels of any variety. I attended the most recent scoping meeting and was very pleased to see that several tunnel options were included. We only support these options.

---

**W201**

**From:** lisamariehayes@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-08-2012 06:03 PM

---

Lisa Hayes  
lisamariehayes@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.



---

**W202**

**From:** nmoon@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 07:28 PM

---

Nancy Moon  
nmoon@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W203**

**From:** skilesk@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 08:22 PM

---

Skiles Kelley  
skilesk@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think TxDot should update their traffic studies before spending any more money PERIOD! Segment1 I-45 Beltway to Loop 610 I am in favor of Alternatives 3&3c:7&8 TxDot must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am Opposed to Alternatives 4 5 &6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and homes. Segment5 2 I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in favor of Alternatives 15,14 & 10 I am opposed to Alternatives 3,11 & 12 Segment 3 I-45 thru Downtown/Pierce Elevated/59 I am in favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDot needs to add exit to I-45)Alternative 5 (but TxDot must move away from the Historic Districts & Alternative 6 (but TxDot needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3,7, &10

---

**W204**

**From:** ringwalds@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 08:59 PM

---

Carrie Carter  
ringwalds@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W205**

**From:** markbeebe52@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 09:54 PM

---

Mark Beebe  
markbeebe52@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W206**

**From:** pdurham001@comcast.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 09:57 PM

---

Phillip Durham  
pdurham001@comcast.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W207**

**From:** house567@earthlink.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 10:26 PM

---

Doug House, M.Ed.  
house567@earthlink.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W208**

**From:** goliad555@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 11:11 PM

---

Carl Doby  
goliad555@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. I also question the amount of traffic that will be using the highways. The cost of fuel will be going up and what is the cost used in the study? where will all these cars park? London and Paris I believe have a tax on bringing in cars to the inner city because the infrastructure cannot handle the extra cars. Why do we think we can be different. we need to create alternate methods to get folks downtown, i.e, mass transit. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. for all above grade highway lanes, noise abatement must be provided. for the alternate 10, green space must be created on the top of the tunnel

---

**W209**

**From:** Aaronlytle@mac.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-08-2012 11:22 PM

---

Aaron Lytle  
Aaronlytle@mac.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W210**

**From:** jcahill@hal-pc.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:38 AM

---

Jane Cahill West  
jcahill@hal-pc.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

It makes no sense to bring traffic traveling through Houston into the center of the city which is already very congested. Pass through traffic should not only be encouraged to take a by-pass route, but forced to do so by requiring all traffic entering the 610 Loop on I-45 to exit into downtown. This way, the only traffic that will enter the 610 loop on I-45 will be traffic destined for an inner-loop location, and much, if not all, of the Pierce Elevated could be eliminated. The proposed new circular loop around downtown could also be eliminated. The proposed loop around downtown should be eliminated as an option because it will create a choke-hold around downtown that will create a physical, visual, and psychological barrier to growth of beneficial areas such as the Theater District. Since the alternatives now being considered are all based on data that is now more than a decade old, they should all be rejected as unfounded. The amount of development that has occurred in proximity to the segments of I-45 now being considered for expansion makes any plan based on data that is so old not just obsolete but also financially and socially irresponsible. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best of those that have been proposed because they promise the least adverse impact to existing neighborhoods: Segment 1 (I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610): I favor Alternates 3 & 3C as the best alternates because they require the least amount of additional ROW. Managed toll lanes should be confined to existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternates 7 and 8 are the next best alternatives because they require less ROW than other alternatives. However, if either of these alternates is chosen, something must be done to abate noise, preferably with landscaping. Segment 2 (I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10): I favor Alternate 15 because it does not require additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy, and because it is the extension of the Hardy alternate preferred for Segment 1. However, if this alternate is chose, sound walls with landscaping should be provided to abate noise from the elevated lanes. My second choice for Segment 2 is Alternate 14 because it requires no additional right of way along I-45 and allows for a tunnel through downtown to Segment 3. My third choice is Alternate 10 with depressed lanes covered by concrete beams that are, in turn, covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and the Near North Side. Segment 3 (I-45 through Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59): I favor Alternate 4, the Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch, but would like to see an exit for traffic to I-45 South. My second and third choices for Segment 3 are Alternates 5 and 6, a Tunnel in existing I-45 ROW, Pierce Elevated, and Bagby Street. However, if either of these alternates is chosen, I-45 must be moved away -- and not take any additional ROW -- from the following neighborhoods: Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. I adamantly oppose Alternates: 3, 7 and 10 for Segment 3 because they all require additional ROW in the Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, and possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W211**

**From:** roamworld@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:44 AM

---

Angela  
roamworld@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I chose my home because I love the historic neighborhood and did not ant to commute to the Woodlands. Please do not destroy it because someone from the Woodlands who chose to commute wants to shave a few minutes off their commute time. I support the alternatives offered by the I-45 coalition including: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W212**

**From:** mandragon@ix.netcom.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 01:09 AM

---

Benjamin Warfield  
mandragon@ix.netcom.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W213**

**From:** ferguson.shiela@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 01:16 AM

---

shiela ferguson  
ferguson.shiela@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W214**

**From:** st\_riceman@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 03:02 AM

---

Stephanie Riceman  
st\_riceman@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W215**

**From:** suzwebb@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 06:58 AM

---

Suzanne Webb  
suzwebb@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, \*\*\*\*TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old \*\*\*\* I am an educator and we teach our students the value of current information!!! It is a shame high school students realize this but adults do not. \*\*\*\*\*(from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W216**

**From:** stacey.saunders713@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 07:06 AM

---

Stacey Saunders  
stacey.saunders713@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. Also, why are rail solutions not being pursued instead? TxDOT seems content to just eat up more neighborhoods and lay more concrete every few years rather than explore rail alternatives that could truly make a difference long-term in alleviating freeway congestion. If TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W217**

**From:** Emilykburton@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 07:13 AM

---

Emily Brandenberger  
Emilykburton@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.



---

**W218**

**From:** Smeh@earthlink.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 07:46 AM

---

Erica McCreedy  
Smeh@earthlink.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/ Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7& 10.

---

**W219**

**From:** beau3015@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:32 AM

---

Stephen Fischer  
beau3015@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. I don't think there should be any expansion of I-45 between 610 & I-10! If traffic cannot be moved to the Hardy corridor for this section, then the tunneling option is what should be used.

---

**W220**

**From:** gamyers@alumni.rice.edu  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:51 AM

---

Gretchen Myers  
gamyers@alumni.rice.edu  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W221**

**From:** beau3015@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:53 AM

---

Beth Fischer  
beau3015@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W222**

**From:** jmatten@swbell.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:54 AM

---

Jan Mattenson  
jmatten@swbell.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Here are reasons for our decisions and a brief description of the alternatives: Segment 1 We are in favor of Alt. 3 & 3c = This alternative adds 2 additional lanes on Hardy and requires only 14' additional feet right-of-way (ROW). Alt. 3c adds 4 elevated managed lanes on 2 structures on Beltway 8, 2 in each direction and requires an additional 100' ROW - 50' from each direction. Alt. 7 -- Adds 4 managed lanes on one elevated structure in middle of I-45 and increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 60' of ROW -- 30' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. Alt. 8 -- Adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerlines. Increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 50' of ROW -- 25' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. We oppose Alt. 4, 5 or 6 because all of these require 150' additional ROW -- either all from the West or from the East or 75' split over both East & West. Segment 2 We are in favor of Alt. 15 = On 610 to Elysian/Hardy, this adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerline with no increase of ROW. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes including landscaping. On Hardy, it will require an additional 24' ROW and provide 2 additional lanes; 1 inbound & 1 outbound. Alt. 14 -- No additional ROW required on I-45. Existing roadway stays the same and a bored tunnel is added to carry 4 managed lanes within the I-45 ROW. Alt. 10 -- No additional ROW required on I-45. The roadway that is below grade level is widened to include 4 managed lanes while staying within ROW. The roadway below grade level is covered with concrete beams for a solid surface at grade level. Includes two 15' outside bike lanes. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT converts this new surface area into usable green space and/or park land. We oppose Alt. 11 & 12 because these both require elevated structures for the managed lanes which will increase noise and sight pollution. Segment 3 We are in favor of Alt. 4 = No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes from an extension of Elysian/Hardy at the North, goes under La Branch and Crawford and terminates at the US 59/SH 288 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to I-45. Alt. 5 - No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Bagby and terminates at Spur 527. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT moves the tunnel further away from Historic Districts Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. We also want an exit to I-45. Alt. 6 - No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Jefferson and terminates at I-45 south of the I-45/US 59 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to US 59. We oppose Alt. 3 -- converting Pierce Elevated and part of US 59 and I-10 into the world's largest round-a-bout would be a waste of time & fuel and would drive excess amounts of traffic to surface roads and neighborhoods. We oppose Alt. 7 -- we do not want any tunnel going under or thru historic neighborhoods including Houston Avenue.

---

**W223**

**From:** ccicack@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:55 AM

---

Christina Cicack  
ccicack@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W224**

**From:** NorthMainToolRental@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:55 AM

---

J. Royce Simpson  
NorthMainToolRental@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. J. Royce Simpson President

---

**W225**

**From:** sailboat6@comcast.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 08:57 AM

---

Mary Robbins  
sailboat6@comcast.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I appreciate the size and complexity of the project, and am thankful to those individuals who dedicated time to developing and evaluating alternatives. I agree with my neighbors whose decisions I have copied below. I do believe studies should be updated. Space for public transportation should be included. Limit acquisition of ROW. Provide noise abatement where appropriate. Consider neighborhoods and property owners that will be affected. Thank you. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W226**

**From:** heathergrass@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 09:07 AM

---

Heather Laureles  
heathergrass@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

As someone who lives in the Heights, noise reduction is a very important issue to me, as well as preserving our historic neighborhood. I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W227**

**From:** janette.g@rocketmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 09:15 AM

---

Janette Lindner  
janette.g@rocketmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that likely does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. I am strongly opposed to elevated structures, especially those that go over existing neighborhoods. I strongly support further study of tunnels and other solutions that do not divide neighborhoods.

---

**W228**

**From:** fclark@hobbycomm.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 09:18 AM

---

F.I. Clark  
fclark@hobbycomm.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W229**

**From:** krys10k@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 09:43 AM

---

Kristen Mueller  
krys10k@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

As a homeowner in the Heights neighborhood of Houston, I am concerned about upcoming proposals concerning the widening of I-45 and its impact on us. I agree with the following comments: I think that spending over \$2 billion of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is inefficient at best. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**W230**

**From:** marcus.greenspan@1993.usna.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 09:52 AM

---

Marcus C. Greenspan  
marcus.greenspan@1993.usna.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W231**

**From:** hkgreenspan@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 09:53 AM

---

Heather Greenspan  
hkgreenspan@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W232**

**From:** almondpye@msn.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 09:59 AM

---

Anna Almond  
almondpye@msn.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Would like to clarify my email sent yesterday. I AM OPPOSED TO EXPANDING THE I-45 CORRIDOR BETWEEN 610/I-10, DESTROYING RESIDENTIAL AREAS FOR FAR FLUNG COMMUTERS! I am a 30 yr Woodland Heights resident. Since expansion appears to be inevitable, I listed "acceptable" options of the alternatives given. I believe Hardy Toll Rd expansion to be in the best interest of my neighborhood. Thank you for your time in considering my opinion.



---

**W233**

**From:** marcus.greenspan@1993.usna.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 10:04 AM

---

Marcus C. Greenspan  
marcus.greenspan@1993.usna.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am against any plans that will threaten to encroach on any existing homes or that will detrimentally impact (e.g. through increased noise, increased traffic through residential neighborhoods, etc.) any existing homes. I am in favor of projects that will improve traffic flow AND preserve or improve the living environment for existing homes along I-45.

---

**W234**

**From:** viulasea@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 10:15 AM

---

Viula Torgerson  
viulasea@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I am in favor of Options 7 & 8 Segment 2: My neighborhood! I am STRONGLY IN FAVOR of Options 14 & 15, with 10 as the only acceptable alternate. I am strongly opposed to 11 & 12 and mildly opposed to 3. Segment 3: I am in favor of options 4,5,6. Strongly opposed to options 3 & 10.

---

**W235**

**From:** jarret@thewebbhome.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:21 AM

---

Jarret Webb  
jarret@thewebbhome.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W236**

**From:** cas@planetfall.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:29 AM

---

Carrie Noxon  
cas@planetfall.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W237**

**From:** angela\_spieldenner@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:32 AM

---

Angela Spieldenner  
angela\_spieldenner@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W238**

**From:** sameerakapasi@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:34 AM

---

Sameera Mahendru  
sameerakapasi@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W239**

**From:** Rn4evr99@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:37 AM

---

Christy Chomin  
Rn4evr99@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W240**

**From:** tou\_shea@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:38 AM

---

Shea Sandefer Hill  
tou\_shea@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W241**

**From:** [coyia.richter@aglife.com](mailto:coyia.richter@aglife.com)  
**To:** [comments@ih45northandmore.com](mailto:comments@ih45northandmore.com)  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:40 AM

---

coyia.richter  
[coyia.richter@aglife.com](mailto:coyia.richter@aglife.com)  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7& 10.

---

**W242**

**From:** [reziajarvis@gmail.com](mailto:reziajarvis@gmail.com)  
**To:** [comments@ih45northandmore.com](mailto:comments@ih45northandmore.com)  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:43 AM

---

Martha Meyers  
[reziajarvis@gmail.com](mailto:reziajarvis@gmail.com)  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Overall I am highly skeptical of spending this much money (over 2 billion dollars) to get so little return (3 mph). I believe that other options need to be pursued. If folks want to get to work faster, perhaps they should move closer – better for the bottom line, better for the environment. That said, if the decision is made to move forward I favor alternatives 3 and 3c for segment 1; I favor alternatives 10 and 14 for segment 2; and I favor alternatives 4 (with exit added for 45) and 6 (with exit added for 59) for segment 3. I live in a community affected by these changes. I believe we need to support neighborhoods, not commuters.

---

**W243**

**From:** Valerie@thewebbhome.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 10:44 AM

---

Valerie Webb  
Valerie@thewebbhome.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W244**

**From:** costadelsol1105@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 10:49 AM

---

Dana Williams  
costadelsol1105@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W245**

**From:** meengland@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:51 AM

---

Liz England  
meengland@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W246**

**From:** howard@howardsherman.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:53 AM

---

howard sherman  
howard@howardsherman.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W247**

**From:** hrheadache@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:56 AM

---

Laurence Stuart  
hrheadache@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W248**

**From:** seanmurphy76@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:56 AM

---

Sean Murphy  
seanmurphy76@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please install a rail line similar to what is in Chicago down the center of 45 to bring people in and out of the city. To not do this would be so short sighted as Houston's growth depends on alternative higher occupancy transportation. Please for the love of God, give us an alternative to the automobile... being stuck in traffic for hours on that road is crazy!!!!



---

**W249**

**From:** suzettelane@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:58 AM

---

Suzette Lane  
suzettelane@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8.

---

**W250**

**From:** melissaenoble@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:02 AM

---

melissa noble  
melissaenoble@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W251**

**From:** adelehoughton@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:03 AM

---

Adele Houghton  
adelehoughton@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7& 10.

---

**W252**

**From:** msternfels@me.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:08 AM

---

Melissa Nicholson Sternfels  
msternfels@me.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am writing to say that I am in full accord with the I-45 Coalition. I live in the Woodland Heights, one block from Houston Avenue and I am 100% completely OPPOSED to any proposed changes to the ROW in the inner-loop at I-45, especially in the Heights area. I am sympathetic to the commute suburban dwellers face during their travels to work, but shaving a couple of minutes peoples' commute does not justify leveling a historic neighborhood, people's homes and a well-loved park. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Thank you for your consideration, Melissa Sternfels

---

**W253**

**From:** cmvermont@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:19 AM

---

chris mongeon  
cmvermont@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please fix the bouncy section of northbound 45 just north of i10.

---

**W254**

**From:** liz.s.vb@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:28 AM

---

Liz Van Burkleo  
liz.s.vb@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = True  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W255**

**From:** kdaven@rice.edu  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 11:31 AM

---

Kimberly Davenport  
kdaven@rice.edu  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000!) that does not adequately reflect the current traffic situation we face more than a decade later. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to the congestion that exists today and will increase in the future . However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7& 10.

---

**W256**

**From:** bghouston@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 11:47 AM

---

Becky Houston  
bghouston@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

As a taxpayer I would like to see TXDOT update their data of traffic flow on I-45 before spending millions of dollars on a project that has the potential of disrupting many neighborhoods and businesses along the I-45 corridor without the added benefit of significant traffic flow improvement. Regarding the options of increasing traffic flow I will comment only on Segment 2: I am in favor of options: 10, 14 and 15, but strongly oppose options: 3, 11 and 12. Fast moving traffic on elevated lanes will result in a significant increase in noise pollution.

---

**W257**

**From:** nathanradtk@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 11:51 AM

---

Nathan Radtke  
nathanradtk@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W258**

**From:** admanhal@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 11:55 AM

---

Braynard H. Werner III  
admanhal@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I do not advocate widening I-45 at any segment. The only exception to this would be if any widening is very minimal and DEDICATED to non-automobile modes of transportation, including passenger rail and/or bicycles. If more private automobile lanes must be added, I support them being built directly above or directly below the existing roadway. There is no cause to continue expanding right of way. We must start building above or below, or even better, begin investing in more efficient forms of transportation that can actually alleviate traffic.

---

**W259**

**From:** joey.hayles@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:01 PM

---

Joseph Hayles  
joey.hayles@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W260**

**From:** sethe@netzero.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:08 PM

---

Seth Eaton  
sethe@netzero.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W261**

**From:** kaf9tx@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 12:12 PM

---

Kimberly Hoyle  
kaf9tx@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W262**

**From:** pperkins@renwd.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 12:13 PM

---

Patricia Perkins  
pperkins@renwd.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W263**

**From:** pcwperkins2007@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 12:15 PM

---

D. Craig Perkins  
pcwperkins2007@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W264**

**From:** trevi83500@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 12:22 PM

---

Jose Trevino  
trevi83500@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Again with taking care of one neighborhood to screw another. Lets talk about preserving everyone and runing a train system in the center of the highways. Like other major cities running a train or subway system. Let people who want to drive in a car by themselves sit in traffic. Rich or not treat everyone the same. And bicycles belong on bike trails, parks or sidewalks but definitely off the major streets and highways.



---

**W265**

**From:** dkelly1@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:25 PM

---

David L. Kelly  
dkelly1@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Primarily, I think that, before anything is done to I45, that the Hardy should be finished into downtown even if it means buying out other entities interest in that tollway to convert it to a FREEway in order to boost utilization. I also think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. If this project proceeds, I favor as follows: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 15. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 3.

---

**W266**

**From:** robgriffith007@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:28 PM

---

Robert Griffith  
robgriffith007@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am a First Ward resident and property owner. I have attended all public meetings, and I Oppose the I-45 expansion project for added hov toll lanes. First Ward is no longer a commercial area. Since the original Tx Dot study was done, this area has completely transformed into a historic and new construction boom town with shops, restaurants, bars, etc. Land values are double what they were just 5 years ago. Any alternatives involving Houston Avenue have the potential of cutting our neighborhood in half and would begin to destroy quality of life and property values immediately. If TX Dot moves forward with the toll managed lane expansion then the I support the I-45 coalition choices for alternates below: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 3,3C, 7, 8 FOR SEGMENT 1: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 15,14,10 FOR SEGMENT 2: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 4,5,6 FOR SEGMENT 3: I am OPPOSED to all other alternatives that have been presented so far.

---

**W267**

**From:** angie-keller@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:29 PM

---

Angie Keller  
angie-keller@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W268**

**From:** dion@dionlaurent.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:42 PM

---

Dion Laurent  
dion@dionlaurent.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

My wife and I recently purchased and now live in an historic home in the Historic First Ward. We are totally opposed to any elevated or surface level expansion of Houston Ave., and feel strongly that TxDOT should stay within the existing ROWs. Any alternatives involving Houston Avenue have the potential of cutting our neighborhood in half and would begin to destroy quality of life and property values immediately. If TX Dot moves forward with the toll managed lane expansion then the I support the I-45 coalition choices for alternates below: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 3,3C, 7, 8 FOR SEGMENT 1: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 15,14,10 FOR SEGMENT 2: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 4,5,6 FOR SEGMENT 3: Dion and Lisa Laurent

---

**W269**

**From:** slalom\_75@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:51 PM

---

Scott Johnson  
slalom\_75@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

When TXDOT uses twelve year old data to justify minimal expansion of highway capacity at enormous cost, my confidence in the department is shaken. TXDOT has said it is a transportation department with the charge to develop all appropriate means of transportation including rail. The vote on METRO's deceptive proposition regarding GMP means minimal rail funding for many years. TXDOT should turn its attention to filling some of the gap that will result. Houston should stop spending more per capita on roads than any of the other top 10 cities and start catching up on transit. Especially inside of the Belt and even more so inside the 610 Loop, we will not be able to build or expand enough highways to meet our needs. It is time to join the 21st century. I wholeheartedly endorse and support the comments submitted by Jane Cahill West, President of Super Neighborhood 22, copied here: It makes no sense to bring traffic traveling through Houston into the center of the city which is already very congested. Pass through traffic should not only be encouraged to take a by-pass route, but forced to do so by requiring all traffic entering the 610 Loop on I-45 to exit into downtown. This way, the only traffic that will enter the 610 loop on I-45 will be traffic destined for an inner-loop location, and much, if not all, of the Pierce Elevated could be eliminated. The proposed new circular loop around downtown could also be eliminated. The proposed loop around downtown should be eliminated as an option because it will create a choke-hold around downtown that will create a physical, visual, and psychological barrier to growth of beneficial areas such as the Theater District. Since the alternatives now being considered are all based on data that is now more than a decade old, they should all be rejected as unfounded. The amount of development that has occurred in proximity to the segments of I-45 now being considered for expansion makes any plan based on data that is so old not just obsolete but also financially and socially irresponsible. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best of those that have been proposed because they promise the least adverse impact to existing neighborhoods: Segment 1 (I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610): I favor Alternates 3 & 3C as the best alternates because they require the least amount of additional ROW. Managed toll lanes should be confined to existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternates 7 and 8 are the next best alternatives because they require less ROW than other alternatives. However, if either of these alternates is chosen, something must be done to abate noise, preferably with landscaping. Segment 2 (I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10): I favor Alternate 15 because it does not require additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy, and because it is the extension of the Hardy alternate preferred for Segment 1. However, if this alternate is chose, sound walls with landscaping should be provided to abate noise from the elevated lanes. My second choice for Segment 2 is Alternate 14 because it requires no additional right of way along I-45 and allows for a tunnel through downtown to Segment 3. My third choice is Alternate 10 with depressed lanes covered by concrete beams that are, in turn, covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and the Near North Side. Segment 3 (I-45 through Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59): I favor Alternate 4, the Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch, but would like to see an exit for traffic to I-45 South. My second and third choices for Segment 3 are Alternates 5 and 6, a Tunnel in existing I-45 ROW, Pierce Elevated, and Bagby Street. However, if either of these alternates is chosen, I-45 must be moved away -- and not take any additional ROW -- from the following neighborhoods: Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. I adamantly oppose Alternates: 3, 7 and 10 for Segment 3 because they all require additional ROW in the Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, and possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W270**

**From:** pmb3@rice.edu  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:56 PM

---

Paige Bailey  
pmb3@rice.edu  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W271**

**From:** tmerrick@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 12:57 PM

---

Tami Merrick  
tmerrick@pspaec.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

From a resident in my First Ward who community who spent many years of her life in an effort to see the Historical Jeff Davis Building was restored: A FIVE ACRE CITY CEMETERY KNOWN AS THE "OLD CITY CEMETERY" LIES IN THE PATHWAY OF THE I-45 PROPOSED EXPANSION AREA IN FIRST WARD. THE CEMETERY WAS FOUNDED IN 1840 AND BURIALS CONTINUED UNTIL 1904. MANY HOUSTONIANS ARE BURIED THERE INCLUDING CIVIL WAR VETERANS, VICTIMS OF YELLOW FEVER AND CHOLERA EPIDEMICS. IT IS BELIVED THAT AS MANY AS 10,000 PEOPLE ARE BURIED ON THIS SITE. IN THE 1920'S THE CITY OF HOUSTON BUILDING THE ORIGINAL JEFFERSON DAVIS HOSPITAL, FIRST HOSPITAL FOR THE INDIGENT OF THE CITY, DIRECTLY ON TOP OF ONE PORTION OF THE CEMETERY. THIS BUILDING HAS BEEN RESTORED AND NOW PROVIDES AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR RESIDENTS OF HOUSTON. IT HAS BEEN RENAMED AS ELDER STREET. PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY SOME OF THE FEW REMAINING HISTORICAL SITES AND BUILDINGS THAT OUR HISTORICAL NEIGHBORHOOD IN HOUSTON HAVE LEFT BY EXPANDING I-45 INTO THE FIRST WARD AREA.

---

**W272**

**From:** csturdivant@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 01:22 PM

---

Carly West  
csturdivant@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W273**

**From:** jchinelli@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 01:42 PM

---

Jeanette Chinelli  
jchinelli@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Time and time again TXDot and all the other entities are making poor decisions for the people who live in Houston. We are forced to shoulder the burden of it all, bad sidewalks, no pedestrian friendly environments, lack of green space, etc. Getting a bigger hammer isn't always the answer. We want local business to have more commerce, building a rail system down Washington Avenue is smart and makes sense, not taking away an existing community to allow cars to replace homes and commerce. When are you going to wake up and pay attention to places like Portland Oregon and build something that creates a community? Other places around the USA make loops for those who are not interested in being downtown. The bottom line is TXDot needs to figure out how to accommodate the tax paying citizens. Dispose of the Pierce elevated and put commerce and its citizens at the top of the list for once. There are new housing developments in the old first ward and the area has taken on a much larger population count and new business needs to be encouraged. I am completely opposed to #3, 7 & 10 in Segment 3. of your fast array of options on the engineering table.

---

**W274**

**From:** jeff.tomlinson@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 01:44 PM

---

Jeff Tomlinson  
jeff.tomlinson@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, please please remove the Pierce Elevated and tunnel I-45 through downtown. It will make the world of difference to the residents of Midtown and, I'm sure, create much more demand for residential downtown. Thank you!

---

**W275**

**From:** carriecarrie@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 01:47 PM

---

Carrie Sutherland  
carriecarrie@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Tunnel the freeway through Downtown Remove the Pierce Elevated Create parkways where there are now ugly freeways

---

**W276**

**From:** jrichmondjr@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 01:51 PM

---

Jonathan Richmond Jr.  
jrichmondjr@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please, Txdot, make sure the freeway is underground. The Pierce Elevated is such an eyesore and has divided downtown for years. this is our one big chance to change all that! Put the new freeway underground! This would make Buffalo Bayou a much more pleasant place. And, it would help the health of our kids. Thank you, JRjr

---

**W277**

**From:** jrengle\_2001@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 01:58 PM

---

J.R. Engle  
jrengle\_2001@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

**From:** tmerrick@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 02:01 PM

---

Tami Merrick  
tmerrick@pspaec.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

The I-45 Expansion project is outdated it sat on a shelf for 8 years. It should be re-examined and the removal of freeways around an expanded city center should be a consideration of The Houston Galveston Area council and TX dot. Cars are contributing to our urban air quality issues. We need consideration given to sustainable means of transportation for those communities inside the 610 loop. Parks, and bike paths should be promoted not freeways dissecting downtown from the surrounding neighborhoods. Review the model given on the Federal Highway website below. Federal Highway Administration website has examples of cities that have adopted Livability Policies. Below I have attached what San Francisco has adopted. The I-45 Expansion project is outdated it sat on a shelf for 8 years. It should be re-examined and the removal of freeways around an expanded city center should be a consideration of The Houston Galveston Area council and TX dot. Cars are contributing to our urban air quality issues. We need consideration given to sustainable means of transportation for those communities inside the 610 loop like parks and bike paths not freeways dissecting downtown from the surrounding neighborhoods. Review the model given on the Federal Highway website below. San Francisco - Livable City - Highly Connected Streets to Support Livability As stated by Secretary LaHood, livability is investing resources in a way that recognizes the unique character of each community. The next three case studies are urban examples of highways role in support of livable communities. In San Francisco, officials are working to provide an interconnected network of express bus and HOV lanes, taking full advantage of their freeway system. This includes converting a traffic lane in each direction on the Bay Bridge for this purpose. (not expanding the bay bridge?) A converted lane on the Bay Bridge will have enormous benefits for ridesharing, which already represents 13% of commuters into the San Francisco area. A dedicated rapid bus system will also reduce traffic on San Francisco's streets. The Livable City's strategy for reclaiming the central city includes: •A street reclaiming program that is turning one-way to two-way street conversions with widened sidewalks and completed bicycle networks, •"Get Transit Moving" with transit-priority measures by improving connections, creating accessible transit, and creating and/or improving plazas and parks, and •Reclaiming streets and parking lots for public spaces. The San Francisco Livable City's complete streets campaign works at three scales: citywide reform, neighborhood planning, and individual projects. San Francisco is working citywide to improve streets standards; improve the effectiveness, responsiveness, and coordination of city departments; and increase funding opportunities for complete streets projects. At the neighborhood scale, they are working to empower every neighborhood to create its own complete streets plan and to secure the funding and bureaucratic support to implement neighborhood plans. (Note they are not dissecting neighborhoods as proposed in this expansion project.) San Francisco is also engaged in innovative projects all over the city to create complete streets and demonstrating what is possible. San Francisco is working to ensure that city streets, which cover over 25% of San Francisco's land area, turn into well-designed, maintained, safe, and attractive public spaces that support walking, bicycling, and public transit (this is a design standard the I-45 expansion project should consider) . Complete neighborhoods exist where walking, bicycling, and transit are the best choices for most trips; where public spaces are beautiful, well designed, and well maintained; and where housing is more plentiful and affordable. (Note they are not trying to pave the urban center.) The citywide strategy in San Francisco includes: •Reclaiming the Central City, •Providing Great Street Networks, •Building Neighborhood Centers , •Providing Home Zones, •Developing a Green Network, •Improving Roadway standards, •Improving planning and public participation, and •Creating stable funding and improve project coordination. Galveston Houston Area Council and Tx Dot should be adopting policies that reflect current design strategies of 2012 to increase mobility and promote sustainability and livability in the city center. The I-45 Expansion project and freeway expansion in an urban center is an outdated model and the primary reason I oppose the project. Mass Transit options with routes worked out with communities to keep the city tax base in tact should be planned not expansion projects shoved down the City of Houston's throat. TX Dot should provide an alternate to remove the noose of freeways around downtown Houston. Tx Dot should be implementing green sustainable highway design and converting existing lanes to more effective means of mass transit decreasing pollution promoting better air quality. We need to make Houston a place to live not drive through. Tami Merrick, AIA Senior Associate | Design AUSTIN DALLAS DENVER HOUSTON WASHINGTON, DC Abu Dhabi Doha Kuwait London PAGE SOUTHERLAND PAGE, LLP 1100 Louisiana, Ste One Houston, Texas 77002 tel: 713 871 8484 713 871 8484 fax: 713 871 8440 www.pspaec.com ARCHITECTURE INTERIORS CONSULTING ENGINEERING



---

**W279**

**From:** dgreco99@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 02:15 PM

---

Debbie Greco  
dgreco99@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Concerned Heights Resident

---

**W280**

**From:** dgreco99@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 02:16 PM

---

Stephen Greco  
dgreco99@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Stephen Greco, Heights Resident

---

**W281**

**From:** rfriedman52@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 02:18 PM

---

Rex Friedman  
rfriedman52@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please tunnel the freeway! Pierce Elevated is a disaster and should be removed. Tunnel I-45 like Wodall Rogers in Dallas. thank you

---

**W282**

**From:** longhornmadness@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 02:20 PM

---

Adam Scheuli  
longhornmadness@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To Whom it May Concern: -Tunnel the freeway -Remove the Pierce Elevated - Make a park where ugly freeways were before

---

**W283**

**From:** dthomaspr@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 02:35 PM

---

Damon Thomas  
dthomaspr@hotmail.com

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W284**

**From:** aflores5@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 02:44 PM

---

Alma  
aflores5@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W285**

**From:** abbyenator@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 02:50 PM

---

Abby Fogelson  
abbyenator@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7& 10.

---

**W286**

**From:** sarita821@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 02:58 PM

---

Sarah Madrid  
sarita821@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W287**

**From:** vise27@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 03:17 PM

---

Carl Matthews  
vise27@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

We should stop and get a current traffic study. We should have longer range goals in mind. Stop taking away business along the corridor and build up or below. Less ROW....

---

**W288**

**From:** frankl@lovetthomes.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 03:19 PM

---

Frank Liu  
frankl@lovetthomes.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

It makes no sense to bring traffic traveling through Houston into the center of the city which is already very congested. Pass through traffic should not only be encouraged to take a by-pass route, but forced to do so by requiring all traffic entering the 610 Loop on I-45 to exit into downtown. This way, the only traffic that will enter the 610 loop on I-45 will be traffic destined for an inner-loop location, and much, if not all, of the Pierce Elevated could be eliminated. The proposed new circular loop around downtown could also be eliminated. The proposed loop around downtown should be eliminated as an option because it will create a choke-hold around downtown that will create a physical, visual, and psychological barrier to growth of beneficial areas such as the Theater District. Since the alternatives now being considered are all based on data that is now more than a decade old, they should all be rejected as unfounded. The amount of development that has occurred in proximity to the segments of I-45 now being considered for expansion makes any plan based on data that is so old not just obsolete but also financially and socially irresponsible. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best of those that have been proposed because they promise the least adverse impact to existing neighborhoods: Segment 1 (I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610): I favor Alternates 3 & 3C as the best alternates because they require the least amount of additional ROW. Managed toll lanes should be confined to existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternates 7 and 8 are the next best alternatives because they require less ROW than other alternatives. However, if either of these alternates is chosen, something must be done to abate noise, preferably with landscaping. Segment 2 (I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10): I favor Alternate 15 because it does not require additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy, and because it is the extension of the Hardy alternate preferred for Segment 1. However, if this alternate is chose, sound walls with landscaping should be provided to abate noise from the elevated lanes. My second choice for Segment 2 is Alternate 14 because it requires no additional right of way along I-45 and allows for a tunnel through downtown to Segment 3. My third choice is Alternate 10 with depressed lanes covered by concrete beams that are, in turn, covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and the Near North Side. Segment 3 (I-45 through Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59): I favor Alternate 4, the Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch, but would like to see an exit for traffic to I-45 South. My second and third choices for Segment 3 are Alternates 5 and 6, a Tunnel in existing I-45 ROW, Pierce Elevated, and Bagby Street. However, if either of these alternates is chosen, I-45 must be moved away -- and not take any additional ROW -- from the following neighborhoods: Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. I adamantly oppose Alternates: 3, 7 and 10 for Segment 3 because they all require additional ROW in the Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, and possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods.

---

**W289**

**From:** kineticdev@msn.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 03:29 PM

---

Devin Robinson  
kineticdev@msn.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10

---

**W290**

**From:** tom\_shepard@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 03:42 PM

---

Thomas W. Shepard III  
tom\_shepard@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Homeowner Comments on the North Houston Highway Improvement Project My name is Tom Shepard. My wife and I own a home at 117 Payne St. which is 300 ft. west of I-45 near North St. Segment 2 Preferences, in order of preference 1. Alternative 10 (below-grade lanes covered by prestressed concrete decking) This is by FAR my preference, but only if the decking is covered by greenspace. 2. Alternative 4 (below grade mainlanes with 4 HOT lanes in middle and cantilevered frontage) 3. Alternative 14 (current configuration + 4-lane HOT tunnel) Segment 3 Preferences This is a difficult choice, as none of the alternatives seems to fully address all of the current traffic-flow problems. I have separated my preferences into 1. as-is alternatives 2. conditional upon more details 1. Equal weight on 3 as-is alternatives (individually inadequate to solve all problems) a. Alternative 5 (tunnel added to current configuration down I-45 and Bagby) b. Alternative 6 (tunnel added to current configuration down I-45 and Jefferson) c. Alternative 9 (tunnel added to current configuration down I-10, I-45 and Jefferson) 2. Alternative 7 (tunnel added to current configuration down Houston Ave., Bagby and Jefferson) This WOULD BE my first choice if TxDoT can allay my concerns about impact to Houston Ave. neighborhoods, and if details about the northern terminus of the tunnel are detailed. However, without those details, I CANNOT weight this as my first choice. ----- Following are Alternatives that I would fight AGAINST: Segment 2 - I DO NOT want to see the selection of any Alternatives that have raised HOT lanes. Segment 3 - I DO NOT want to see the selection of any of the "Huge Traffic Circle" Alternatives.

---

**W291**

**From:** uptowncommercialproperties@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 03:56 PM

---

Jay Jahangiri  
uptowncommercialproperties@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear Tx Dot, I am against any widening and adding Managed Lanes Of I-45 North. Please consider adding more lanes on North Shepherd as an alternative to widening I-45 North or Adding lanes to The Hardy Toll Road. Thank You, Jay Jahangiri 281-440-9556 281-440-9556

---

**W292**

**From:** e\_york@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 03:57 PM

---

E York  
e\_york@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Generally I am a proponent of building highways but I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W293**

**From:** sherwinjah@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 04:07 PM

---

Sherwin Jahangiri  
sherwinjah@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I don't believe adding lanes on I-45 North would help improve traffic. The problem is not the amount of lanes on the highway, it is the way the highway was drawn up. The problem point is the I-45 North at N. Shepherd. I believe that North Shepherd should be widened, thus relieving most of the congestion on I-45. Many people travel on I-45 North in order to get to the 610 Loop. By developing N. Shepherd, this will create a more efficient highway system in Houston.

---

**W294**

**From:** rominj@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 04:11 PM

---

Soheila Jahangiri  
rominj@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear TXDOT, I am against widening the lanes on IH-45 North. It will negatively affect the quality of life in the surrounding communities. Thank you

---

**W295**

**From:** aaronamjadi@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 04:14 PM

---

Aaron Amjadi  
aaronamjadi@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I prefer adding lanes only to the Hardy Toll road. I am against adding more to IH-45 North. I live in the Woodlands. It would benefit me more

---

**W296**

**From:** tom\_helm@live.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 04:14 PM

---

Thomas Helm  
tom\_helm@live.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

As a homeowner and commercial property owner located only a few blocks west of I-45 in the historic Woodland Heights, I am mainly concerned with the section between 610 and I-10. My opinion is that the only options that are acceptable for this project would be ones which do not take any additional ROW, nor would they have any elevated sections. My primary preference would be that other alternatives are considered, such as expanding the use of passenger rail and making the Hardy Toll Road much wider. However, if money is going to be spent "improving" I-45, then the only acceptable options would be to use tunnels to add lanes. In addition to the tunnel option, I would love to see the existing surface lanes be roofed with concrete slabs and a greenspace be put there. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment and be involved in this process.



---

**W297**

**From:** heatherthomas1978@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 04:28 PM

---

Heather Thomas  
heatherthomas1978@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please, please remove the Pierce Elevated and sink the new freeway below grade as they've done in Dallas with Woodall Rogers. We could even put a park atop the new sunken freeway, as they've done in Dallas. Come on, Houston. At least keep up with Dallas!!

---

**W298**

**From:** lachrymose@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 04:30 PM

---

Judith Chang  
lachrymose@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am AGAINST spending anymore money on road expansion until proper studies are done to reflect the current traffic situations and environment of Houston \*today\*. Road expansion in Houston has primarily been a failure. After spending numerous years to expand a freeway, the problem is alleviated for a short-term. Take a look at 610 and I-10. I agree with Jim Weston of the I-45 Coalition: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W299**

**From:** toonsotheroof@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 04:32 PM

---

Jackie Harrison  
toonsotheroof@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

NHHIP, it would be a breath of fresh air, literally, if you were to place the new freeway below grade and build a park or parkway above. The noise and pollution created by the Pierce Elevated and the freeway north of downtown through the Heights is a hazard to our health. It is also an eyesore and attracts all types of seedy characters. Please, for the sake of the city and our children, consider sinking the freeway below the surface. Tunneling it would be ideal. But, please make this a priority! Sincerely, J Harrison

---

**W300**

**From:** texans2009@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 04:36 PM

---

Fontana Smith-Levinson  
texans2009@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

1. Tunnel the freeway through downtown and the Heights (at least) 2. Remove all the ugly structures such as the Pierce Elevated. 3. One amazing idea I've seen is to actually keep a lot of the overpasses along the western side of downtown and make them into a park that connects to White Oaks and Buffalo Bayou parks. 4. Watch the city flourish!

---

**W301**

**From:** kalze@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 04:37 PM

---

Kallie Benes  
kalze@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W302**

**From:** dcm7r@juno.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 04:49 PM

---

Deborah Milner  
dcm7r@juno.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

The one-way downtown loop does not seem practical. Many people use at least parts of those highways in both directions, and requiring someone to go all the way around the loop instead of, say, 1/4 the way around seems impractical and inefficient.

---

**W303**

**From:** suparna.salil@bakerbotts.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 04:50 PM

---

Suparna Salil  
suparna.salil@bakerbotts.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods) & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10

---

**W304**

**From:** storyville.pub.lmt@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 05:03 PM

---

James Wixted  
storyville.pub.lmt@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I would like TXDOT to research and consider using a polymer aggregate pour to reduce external noise and tire wear. I live in 2016 Main St. beside the Pierce Elevated and micro-particulate "dust" is a huge public health issue that TXDOT should research ways to mitigate. Please subscribe me to your regular newsletter. Thank you. -JMW

---

**W305**

**From:** jon.w.cooper@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 05:09 PM

---

Jon Cooper  
jon.w.cooper@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 4, 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12

---

**W306**

**From:** ecovalla@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 05:23 PM

---

Elizabeth Covalla  
ecovalla@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W307**

**From:** meztarturo2003@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 05:23 PM

---

Arturo Meza  
meztarturo2003@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am in Favor of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am in Favor of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am in Favor of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W308**

**From:** jday@daypllc.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 06:00 PM

---

Jonathan C.C. Day  
jday@daypllc.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

PLEASE SLOW DOWN YOUR REVIEW PROCESS AND GET THIS RIGHT I am a resident of the Woodland Heights. My children go to Travis Elementary which is within 1000 yards of I-45. I agree with the I-45 Coalition. Spending more than \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. I still do not understand why TX DOT believes that traffic congestion must be solved at SUCH GREAT COST. It seems that all we do by developing massive stretches of pavement is encourage sprall, large energy inefficient homes, and massive commutes. In other words, there is a huge environmental and cultural cost to the suburbs and ex-burbs. Why are we so eager to subsidize further suburban and ex-burban growth? That said, I fully support the Neighborhood Volunteer Representatives who have advised that these are the best alternatives for our neighborhood. I trust them. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W309**

**From:** proctor@artconservators.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 06:16 PM

---

Robert Proctor  
proctor@artconservators.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Regarding the 3 Universes and their alternates. As for addressing traffic on I45 as for many Texas highways troubles seem to initiate from connectivity, such too many on and off ramps and ill designed exchanges at freeway intersections. Unfortunately, none of this is addressed in the information that has been presented. For example, the potential of tunnels is very intriguing, but if the portals to these tunnels are not well designed they could easily result in worse traffic jams than what we are faced with. Furthermore, the alternatives seem to address different problems without any information as to what is really needed in these segment. For example, in segment 3, the tunnel options will function only to move paying people through downtown one delivering to 59 one to 45 and one to both, while alt 3 moves everyone around downtown. Arguably the most important information for choosing any one of the tunnel options over another, which highway most southbound traffic is headed towards, is unknown making it impossible to make informed choices. In Segment 1, the movement of traffic to Hardy seems the least impacting, but it is unclear if adding pay lanes to Hardy would even be necessary or if simply improving connectivity would be sufficient. Furthermore it is unclear how many people would even use this option if connectivity were improved. To the dismay of many of us keeping up with the evolution of the expansion of I 45 over the years is the cooption of tunnel proposition to "managed" lane usage. This is particularly troublesome to those of us that have been pushed off the HOV lanes on I10 during certain hours when these lanes are functioning as toll lanes exclusively. All of this being said, I stand with the I-45 Coalition in supporting the following: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. 10 BEING BY FAR THE MOST OPTIMUM IF AND ONLY IF THE "CONCRETE BEAMS" COVER AS LARGE OF AN AREA AS POSSIBLE (for ventilation purposes) AND COVERED BY GREEN SPACE! I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. Sincerely, Robert Proctor, 402 Byrne st Houston, TX 77009

---

## W310

**From:** kevin@betterhouston.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 06:34 PM

---

Kevin McNally  
kevin@betterhouston.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am writing to give my comments of the North Houston Highway Improvement Project. I am most concerned about the additions/changes to Segment 3 (downtown) so I will voice those concerns first. I am in favor of Alternative 5, with my second choice as Alternative 7. Alternative 5 limits the impact the highway relocation will have on the surrounding downtown community due to it being tunneled. Alternative 7 does the same, but I do not think the additional tunnel under Jefferson will be required because of the amount of traffic that would already be funneled under Bagby. The additional expense to do the same on Jefferson after the demand load has been decreased would be a waste of state funds. I am absolutely against Alternatives 8A and 8B due to the long term impact they would have to the communities along the Washington Ave Corridor. As for Segment 1, I am in favor of Alternative 3 along the Harvy Toll Road because of its limited expansion of the right-of-way and the potential to run future light rail transit between the north and south lanes. I have no comments for Segment 2, as I am less worried about the alternatives there. Thank you, Kevin McNally Urban Planner, Project Manager BetterHouston Downtown Houston Resident

---

## W311

**From:** txdornbusch@aol.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 07:04 PM

---

Tom Dornbusch  
txdornbusch@aol.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Re: IH45 project proposals I do not support spending ANY transportation funds on this project until TxDOT updates the traffic studies, data from 2000 that is over 12 years old, and determines cost-effective solutions for today's congestion. I agree that the following alternatives, as indicated by the IH45 Coalition, are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods: Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I Favor: Alternate 3 & 3C – the least amount of additional ROW is required. Managed toll lanes on existing and new expansion of Hardy to downtown. Alternate 7 – less ROW required – BUT TxDOT must provide method for noise abatement on all elevated structures and feeder roads to reduce increased noise levels with landscaping. Alternate 8 - less ROW required – Provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increase noise levels with landscaping. I Oppose: Alternates: 4, 5 or 6 because they all require 150' in additional ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I Favor: Alternate 15 - no additional ROW at 610 to Elysian/Hardy. Provide sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes to neighborhoods with landscaping. This is also the extension of Hardy expansion in Segment 1. Alternate 14 - no additional right of way along I-45 allows for tunnel into downtown Segment 3. Alternate 10 – no additional right of way with depressed lanes w/ concrete beams covered and converted into usable green space/park land between Heights and Near North Side. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I Favor: Alternate 4 – Tunnel along Elysian/Hardy down Crawford and La Branch; no additional ROW. Add an exit for traffic to 45 South. Alternate 5 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Bagby Street. TxDOT must move away from & not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. Alternate 6 – Tunnel in existing 45 ROW, Pierce Elevated and Jefferson Street. TxDOT must not take any additional ROW from Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. I Oppose: Alternates: 3, 7 or 10 because they all require additional ROW in Heights, Old Sixth Ward, First Ward, possibly Montrose and Midtown neighborhoods. Additionally, to reduce land speculation and lessen the freeway use by local traffic that should be on local roads, no new feeder roads should be developed. This would serve to reduce congestion and increase mainlane safety since fewer local trip drivers would be accessing the freeway. TxDOT stated support for no frontage lanes as a general freeway design concept at the 10/24/12 public meeting arranged by the IH45 Coalition. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

**W312**

**From:** briekelman@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 07:28 PM

---

Brie Kelman  
briekelman@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods &Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W313**

**From:** scottdougkelman@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 07:28 PM

---

Scott Kelman  
scottdougkelman@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods &Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.



---

**W314**

**From:** capt dick99@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 07:39 PM

---

Richard Simpson  
capt dick99@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Please note my position on the proposals submitted by TxDOT. Segment 3 Alternate 4 - In favor of. No additional ROW required, provides a bored tunnel. Note: Contingent upon adding an exit to I-45. Alternate 5 - In favor of. No additional ROW required. Note: Contingent upon moving further away from Historic Districts Avondale West, Audubon Place and First Montrose. Alternate 6 - In favor of. No additional ROW required. Contingent upon adding an exit to US 59. Oppose Alternate 3 – Oppose Alternate 7 –

---

**W315**

**From:** harrymcm@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:05 PM

---

Harry McMahan  
harrymcm@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W316**

**From:** ariellegarrison@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:05 PM

---

Arielle McMahan  
ariellegarrison@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W317**

**From:** npwatkins@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:09 PM

---

Nathan Watkins  
npwatkins@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To Whom It May Concern: The following message was sent to Pat Henry on November 5, 2012. The information from Pat Henry represents the basis for selecting TxDOT's alternatives 3 and 4 of Segment 1. Please find quoted text below: "Nathan Watkins npwatkins@gmail.com Nov 5 (4 days ago) to: Pat.Henry Mr. Henry: I have a question regarding the Universe of Alternatives, Segment 1. I am specifically concerned about the proposed ROW on the east side of Interstate Highway 45 (I-45), between Airline and Parker Rd. At the 2nd Public Scoping Meeting held on October 2012, Segment 1 alternatives remaining were 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, & 8. My question is: Which alternative under Segment 1 would not affect the ROW on the east side of I-45 between Airline and Parker Rd? I would greatly appreciate a response as we have been protesting against TxDOT regarding the proposed ROW on the east side of I-45. If we could choose one of the alternatives which does not affect this area, we could support TxDOT's expansion. In point of fact, we would support any alternative TxDOT would have as long as it leaves this area alone. We are not anti-TxDOT we are just anti-expansion of the ROW to the east of I-45 between the Airline and Parker Rd. Thank you in advance for your help. Sincerely, Nathan Watkins Pat Henry Nov 5 (4 days ago) to: me Alternatives 3 and 4 would not require right of way (ROW) on the east side. Alternative 5 would require 150 ft., alt. 6 would need 75 ft., alt. 7 would require 30 ft, and alt. 8 would require 25 ft. From: Nathan Watkins [mailto:npwatkins@gmail.com] Sent: Monday, November 05, 2012 10:35 AM To: Pat Henry Subject: TxDOT Universe of Alternatives, Segment 1: Inquiry"

---

**W318**

**From:** incantation@mac.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 08:11 PM

---

Rowan TwoSisters  
incantation@mac.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W319**

**From:** kristin\_netherland@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 08:26 PM

---

Kristin Netherland  
kristin\_netherland@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W320**

**From:** cecil.gammill@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 08:41 PM

---

Cecil Gammill  
cecil.gammill@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To Whom It May Concern: I have obtained about 240 signatures from business owners and their employees who are located on the east side of I-45 between Airline and Parker. We have been told by TxDOT that in Segment 1 (our area) Alternatives 3 or 4 will not result in TxDOT taking any property from the east side of I-45 in our area. If so, then we want Alternatives 3 or 4 for our Segment. Sincerely, Cecil

---

**W321**

**From:** cecil.gammill@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 08:46 PM

---

Cecil Gammill  
cecil.gammill@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To Whom It May Concern: Jim Weston makes some good points - namely TxDOT wants to spend about 2 billion of our hard earned tax dollars on a project which will - according to the fine people at TxDot - not make a dent in the congestion on the North Freeway. Jim Weston is right! We should not waste our money! I think the very intelligent folks at TxDOT can do better. This is a big task for this area. It deserves a better answer than is currently proposed. TxDOT should STOP right now and rethink their entire project, especially Segment 1. It would be greatly appreciated if TxDOT would reconsider their project by not taking any property from the east side of I-45;especially with the large number of businesses. Sincerely, Cecil

---

**W322**

**From:** janisbarnard@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 08:54 PM

---

Janis Barnard  
janisbarnard@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Expansion Project: I am a First Ward resident and property owner. I have attended all public meetings, and I oppose the I-45 expansion project for added HOV toll lanes. First Ward is no longer a commercial area. Since the original TX Dot study was done, this area has completely transformed into a historic and new construction boom town with renovated homes, new homes, shops, restaurants, bars, etc. Land values are double what they were just a few years ago. Any alternatives involving Houston Avenue have the potential of cutting our neighborhood in half and would begin to destroy quality of life and property values immediately. If TX Dot moves forward with the toll managed lane expansion then the I support the I-45 coalition choices for alternates below: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 3,3C, 7, 8 FOR SEGMENT 1: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 15,14,10 FOR SEGMENT 2: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 4,5,6 FOR SEGMENT 3: I am OPPOSED to all other alternatives that have been presented so far.

---

**W323**

**From:** johnbarnard3@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:55 PM

---

John M. Barnard  
johnbarnard3@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Expansion Project: I am a First Ward resident and property owner. I have attended all public meetings, and I oppose the I-45 expansion project for added HOV toll lanes. First Ward is no longer a commercial area. Since the original TX Dot study was done, this area has completely transformed into a historic and new construction boom town with renovated homes, new homes, shops, restaurants, bars, etc. Land values are double what they were just a few years ago. Any alternatives involving Houston Avenue have the potential of cutting our neighborhood in half and would begin to destroy quality of life and property values immediately. If TX Dot moves forward with the toll managed lane expansion then the I support the I-45 coalition choices for alternates below: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 3,3C, 7, 8 FOR SEGMENT 1: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 15,14,10 FOR SEGMENT 2: I am in FAVOR FOR ALTERNATES 4,5,6 FOR SEGMENT 3: I am OPPOSED to all other alternatives that have been presented so far.

---

**W324**

**From:** e.a.dieckman@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 08:57 PM

---

eric a. dieckman  
e.a.dieckman@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W325**

**From:** treehalpc@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 09:24 PM

---

Larry Lambertz  
treehalpc@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

My comment is this: I have been clicking around on this site for 45 minutes looking for a concise explanation of what are these alternatives you are proposing. Take down this web site and put one up that explains what these alternative projects involve, in plain, easy to read and understand english. Furnish some simplified maps that don't require an engineering degree to understand. You have spent much time trying to make this web site as hard to understand as possible. Until you choose to clarify what it is you are proposing, my suggestion is to do nothing until you make these multiple plans much easier for the non-engineer to understand. Hire someone to re-do the web site. Then ask for comments.

---

**W326**

**From:** cecil.gammill@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 09:27 PM

---

Cecil Gammill  
cecil.gammill@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

To Whom It May Concern: It is my understanding, TxDot's main goal with this project, for Segment 1, is to install 4 managed lanes on either the North Freeway or the Hardy toll road. The number of regular lanes on the North Freeway will not change. The southern terminus of the Hardy is being extended so as to make the Hardy a more useful highway. The Hardy is very underused for most of a 24 hour day. It is not heavily traveled because many commercial vehicles as well as many private use vehicles are not willing to pay to use it. The simplest and best solution is to remove user fees from the Hardy when it is finished. HMETRO needs to work with TxDot to do this. HMETRO does not own the Hardy; we the taxpayers do. Removing user fees from the Hardy will allow TxDot to install their managed lanes on the Hardy; it will give the Feds their hurricane evacuation route; it will take a great deal of traffic pressure off the North Freeway; and it will save we taxpayers a great deal of money. It is worth remembering, the Hardy was supposed to be free once it was paid off, not when the entire toll road system was finished as HMETRO currently claims. Our elected officials need to be active in helping this goal to be achieved. We, the taxpayers, do not work for TxDot or HMETRO. They work for us. Sincerely, Cecil

---

**W327**

**From:** txsparkle.marci@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 09:41 PM

---

Marci Perry  
txsparkle.marci@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I drive I-45 every other day.. Many times during rush hour. This has given me the following ideas.. Traffic congestion is in part caused by cars entering the freeway from too many streets. I suggest either permanently closing some entrances, in an alternating manner or at least creating a system where gates close those entrances during rush hour. A gate system might be the best alternative. I notice there is always congestion caused by the entrance ramp to 610 at the I-45 south entrance, part of that is caused by the Cross Timbers entrance to I-45 being too close to the interchange. There are people who enter the freeway there during rush hour and in working their way across to the southbound lanes of 45 contribute to the congestion there.

---

**W328**

**From:** marcie.omalley@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 10:03 PM

---

Marcia O'Malley  
marcie.omalley@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Section 1: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Section 2: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Section 3: I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods &Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W329**

**From:** pkellogg@hwa.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-09-2012 10:07 PM

---

Paul Kellogg  
pkellogg@hwa.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Thank you for considering the views of the residents and businesses along these corridors. However, I am opposed to starting this project until TXDOT gathers current traffic data that will lead to the best solutions for current needs. If TXDOT does proceed, I prefer the following alternatives: Segment 1 - I support Alternatives 3, 3C, and 4, as the least disruptive to existing land uses along the route. I oppose all of the other choices. Segment 2 - I support Alternatives 3, 5, 9, 12, and 15. I oppose all of the other choices. Segment 3 - I support Alternatives 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10. I oppose all of the other choices. I am vehemently opposed to using Houston Avenue for a tunnel.

---

**W330**

**From:** cote-stockton@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:31 PM

---

Pete Stockton  
cote-stockton@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

November 9,2012 Dear TXDOT, I am a citizen stakeholder who will be effected by the North Houston Highway Improvement Project. Over the last ten years, Houston has seen explosive redevelopment near downtown. Continuing to route and further expand arterial traffic through the middle of town will frustrate development and growth. Houston's downtown is effectively cut off from its surroundings. Arterial traffic isolates the theater district , stadiums, and other centrally located destinations. Any freeway development that can eliminate or mitigate this isolation is desirable. Thank you Pete Stockton

---

**W331**

**From:** planner.eb@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:49 PM

---

Elizabeth Brooks  
planner.eb@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: 1st Choice: No build. 2nd Choice: Hardy Toll Road, Alternative 3 because it maintains the ROW, while increasing capacity (2 lanes) and maintains a space for future lane and/or transit expansion along existing rail. Opposed to: Alternatives 4, 5, and 6, because it is unclear how the increased ROW will affect existing business and residences along the corridor. Segment 2: 1st Choice: Alternative 3 2nd Choice: Alternative 10 Segment 3: 1st Choice: Alternative 4 - tunnel under La Branch and Crawford, if additional exit to I-45 is added 2nd Choice: Alternative 5 - tunnel under I-45 and Bagby to connect to 59 South. Opposed to: Alternative 3 - Many planners and economists believe that the one way loop around downtown Dallas "killed it". Opposed to: Alternative 8 and 9, due to the complete disruption caused to Houston Avenue and the surrounding neighborhoods. Opposed to: Alternative 10



---

**W332**

**From:** barbaratennant@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:49 PM

---

Barbara Tennant  
barbaratennant@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W333**

**From:** frankblake@juno.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:56 PM

---

Frank Blake  
frankblake@juno.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59), but NO WIDENING OF EXISTING I-45 within this segment; NO further encroachment on park land along Buffalo Bayou and NO widening of the Pierce Elevated. The elevated is plenty wide enough. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W334**

**From:** jweston33@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:57 PM

---

Jim Weston  
jweston33@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am very pleased that TxDOT has listened to the 100's of residents in the area and have agreed to stay within TxDOT's original ROW - thank you for that! I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. That's all you need to say – please send your comments to <http://ih45northandmore.com/email.aspx> before the deadline of midnight Friday, November 9th. Thank you for staying involved! This is a critical time for this project! Jim Weston I-45 Coalition

---

**W335**

**From:** jim@i-45coalition.org  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 10:59 PM

---

I-45 Coalition  
jim@i-45coalition.org  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 THANK YOU TxDOT for agreeing to stay within the existing ROW for this area! It is vital that TxDOT continues with that commitment! I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10. That's all you need to say – please send your comments to <http://ih45northandmore.com/email.aspx> before the deadline of midnight Friday, November 9th. Thank you for staying involved! This is a critical time for this project! Jim Weston I-45 Coalition

---

**W336**

**From:** paulasnyder@att.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:16 PM

---

Paula Snyder  
paulasnyder@att.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I SUPPORT Alternatives 3 & 3c utilizing the Hardy Toll Road; or Alternative 7 or 8 utilizing I-45 (with noise abatement provided by TxDOT for the additional noise created by traffic on the elevated lanes). I OPPOSE Alternatives 4, 5, & 6 because of the additional ROW required, which would displace existing businesses and homes. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I SUPPORT Alternatives 15, 14 & 10 (with proposed "deck park"). I OPPOSE Alternatives 3, 11 & 12. Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / US 59 I SUPPORT Alternative 4 (with exit added to I-45), Alt. 5 (with no historic neighborhoods affected and with an exit added to I-45) & Alt. 6 (with an exit added to US 59). I OPPOSE Alternatives 3, 7& 10.

---

**W337**

**From:** nguyen\_kristen@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:17 PM

---

Kristen Burke  
nguyen\_kristen@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

We oppose I45 expansion in particular segments 2 and 3. Thank you.

---

**W338**

**From:** lastconcertcafe@sbcglobal.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:29 PM

---

Dawn N. Fudge  
lastconcertcafe@sbcglobal.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Suggested comments: I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7& 10. That's all you need to say – please send your comments to <http://ih45northandmore.com/email.aspx> before the deadline of midnight Friday, November 9th. Thank you for staying involved! This is a critical time for this project! Jim Weston I-45 Coalition Here are reasons for our decisions and a brief description of the alternatives: Segment 1 We are in favor of Alt. 3 & 3c = This alternative adds 2 additional lanes on Hardy and requires only 14' additional feet right-of-way (ROW). Alt. 3c adds 4 elevated managed lanes on 2 structures on Beltway 8, 2 in each direction and requires an additional 100' ROW - 50' from each direction. Alt. 7 – Adds 4 managed lanes on one elevated structure in middle of I-45 and increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 60' of ROW – 30' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. Alt. 8 – Adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerlines. Increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 50' of ROW– 25' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. We oppose Alt. 4, 5 or 6 because all of these require 150' additional ROW – either all from the West (Alt 4) or from the East (Alt 5) or 75' split over both East & West (Alt 6). Segment 2 We are in favor of Alt. 15 = On 610 to Elysian/Hardy , this adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerline with no increase of ROW. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes including landscaping. On Hardy, it will require an additional 24' ROW and provide 2 additional lanes; 1 inbound & 1 outbound. Alt. 14– No additional ROW required on I-45. Existing roadway stays the same and a bored tunnel is added to carry 4 managed lanes within the I-45 ROW. Alt. 10 –No additional ROW required on I-45. The roadway that is below grade level is widened to include 4 managed lanes while staying within ROW. The roadway below grade level is covered with concrete beams for a solid surface at grade level. Includes two 15' outside bike lanes. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT converts this new surface area into usable green space and/or park land. We oppose Alt. 11 & 12 because these both require elevated structures for the managed lanes which will increase noise and sight pollution. Segment 3 We are in favor of Alt. 4 = No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes from an extension of Elysian/Hardy at the North, goes under La Branch and Crawford and terminates at the US 59/SH 288 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to I-45. Alt. 5- No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Bagby and terminates at Spur 527. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT moves the tunnel further away from Historic Districts Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. We also want an exit to I-45. Alt. 6- No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Jefferson and terminates at I-45 south of the I-45/US 59 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to US 59. We oppose Alt. 3 – converting Pierce Elevated and part of US 59 and I-10 into the world's largest round-a-bout would be a waste of time & fuel and would drive excess amounts of traffic to surface roads and neighborhoods. We oppose Alt. 7 – we do not want any tunnel going under or thru historic neighborhoods including Houston Avenue.

---

**W339**

**From:** seazm1@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:33 PM

---

Eleonore Orgish  
seazm1@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Why are there no tunnelling options that include a rail line? (Like I-75 in Dallas) That would be my preference. I do not think people like to drive their cars in a tunnel, especially with the flooding issue we have had. So the managed lanes on a up-level structure (not two levels!) is my preference. Segment 1 - choice 7 Segment 2 - choice 11 Segment 3 - choice 10

---

**W340**

**From:** noah\_brenner@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:45 PM

---

Noah Brenner  
noah\_brenner@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion.

---

**W341**

**From:** noah\_brenner@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:46 PM

---

Noah Brenner

noah\_brenner@hotmail.com

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W342**

**From:** noah\_brenner@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:47 PM

---

Noah Brenner

noah\_brenner@hotmail.com

Here are reasons for our decisions and a brief description of the alternatives: Segment 1 We are in favor of Alt. 3 & 3c = This alternative adds 2 additional lanes on Hardy and requires only 14' additional feet right-of-way (ROW). Alt. 3c adds 4 elevated managed lanes on 2 structures on Beltway 8, 2 in each direction and requires an additional 100' ROW - 50' from each direction. Alt. 7 – Adds 4 managed lanes on one elevated structure in middle of I-45 and increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 60' of ROW – 30' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. Alt. 8 – Adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerlines. Increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 50' of ROW– 25' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. We oppose Alt. 4, 5 or 6 because all of these require 150' additional ROW – either all from the West (Alt 4) or from the East (Alt 5) or 75' split over both East & West (Alt 6). Segment 2 We are in favor of Alt. 15 = On 610 to Elysian/Hardy , this adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerline with no increase of ROW. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes including landscaping. On Hardy, it will require an additional 24' ROW and provide 2 additional lanes; 1 inbound & 1 outbound. Alt. 14– No additional ROW required on I-45. Existing roadway stays the same and a bored tunnel is added to carry 4 managed lanes within the I-45 ROW. Alt. 10 –No additional ROW required on I-45. The roadway that is below grade level is widened to include 4 managed lanes while staying within ROW. The roadway below grade level is covered with concrete beams for a solid surface at grade level. Includes two 15' outside bike lanes. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT converts this new surface area into usable green space and/or park land. We oppose Alt. 11 & 12 because these both require elevated structures for the managed lanes which will increase noise and sight pollution. Segment 3 We are in favor of Alt. 4 = No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes from an extension of Elysian/Hardy at the North, goes under La Branch and Crawford and terminates at the US 59/SH 288 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to I-45. Alt. 5- No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Bagby and terminates at Spur 527. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT moves the tunnel further away from Historic Districts Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. We also want an exit to I-45. Alt. 6- No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Jefferson and terminates at I-45 south of the I-45/US 59 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to US 59. We oppose Alt. 3 – converting Pierce Elevated and part of US 59 and I-10 into the world's largest round-a-bout would be a waste of time & fuel and would drive excess amounts of traffic to surface roads and neighborhoods. We oppose Alt. 7 – we do not want any tunnel going under or thru historic neighborhoods including Houston Avenue.

---

**W343**

**From:** Lfwilkerson@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:47 PM

---

Larry Wilkerson  
Lfwilkerson@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Dear TxDOT, For Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 - I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Thank you.

---

**W344**

**From:** noah\_brenner@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-09-2012 11:52 PM

---

Noah Brenner  
noah\_brenner@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I am in favor of the no action alternative for the North Houston Highway Improvement Project- I do not believe that the highway expansion is a good use of taxpayer money. In these tough financial times I think we need to use government money in the most efficient way possible and I do not think the small increase in average speeds is worth the money that would be spent on the project. Those dollars could better be used in other ways or, if there are not compelling government projects to spend the money on, then maybe we should save it or use it to pay down debts. I am a fiscal conservative who believes in small government and I think it is time for government to stop spending money just because it is there. If nothing else, give it back to the people that worked hard to earn it.

---

**W345**

**From:** bcr687@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-10-2012 12:07 AM

---

Brennan Rosales  
bcr687@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think in addition to any improvements made to the freeway itself, it would be prudent to also focus some improvements to the streets that serve as arteries to downtown from the near-north areas e.g. N Main, Fulton, Airline, and Irvington. Also I think connecting N San Jacinto directly to Fulton would be an attractive new alternative to current options in/out of the downtown area.

---

**W346**

**From:** noah\_brenner@hotmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-10-2012 12:07 AM

---

Noah Brenner  
noah\_brenner@hotmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I favor the no action alternative. I do not believe that we need to expand the North Houston highways at this time. If transportation planners feel that additional highway capacity is needed please do not take any additional right of way in any areas. I bought my house near I-45 in the First Ward two years ago. I saved for years and worked hard to buy my first home myself. It is a historic home that had fallen into disrepair and had been a center of drug use and other illegal activity for years. I still find homemade knife blades and drug paraphernalia in the back yard. I am investing thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours of labor into restoring it and making it a nice place to live. I am not alone in my investment in this neighborhood. Expanding the footprint of I-45 will destroy that investment. What is the economic benefit from allowing people to drive through Houston 3 miles per hour faster? My neighbors and I have taken a neighborhood that was run down and depressed and turned it into one of the most desirable places to live in the city and we did it with private investment, not government tax dollars. New business are opening on Houston Avenue, property values are increasing and all of this activity is creating more tax revenue for state and local governments. Why do you want to take our tax dollars and destroy the prosperity that we have created? Please do not expand the North Houston highways. There is very little benefit created by the highway expansion and it would destroy so much that we have worked so hard to create.



---

**W347**

**From:** kfbolger@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 12:10 AM

---

Kathy Bolger  
kfbolger@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses.

---

**W348**

**From:** kfbolger@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 12:12 AM

---

Noah Brenner  
kfbolger@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I am opposed to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I am IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W349**

**From:** kfbolger@gmail.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 12:14 AM

---

Kathy Bolger  
kfbolger@gmail.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 1 We are in favor of Alt. 3 & 3c = This alternative adds 2 additional lanes on Hardy and requires only 14' additional feet right-of-way (ROW). Alt. 3c adds 4 elevated managed lanes on 2 structures on Beltway 8, 2 in each direction and requires an additional 100' ROW - 50' from each direction. Alt. 7 - Adds 4 managed lanes on one elevated structure in middle of I-45 and increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 60' of ROW - 30' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. Alt. 8 - Adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerlines. Increases feeder streets from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in each direction. Requires an additional 50' of ROW - 25' from each side. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides noise abatement on ALL elevated structures to reduce noise levels. We oppose Alt. 4, 5 or 6 because all of these require 150' additional ROW - either all from the West (Alt 4) or from the East (Alt 5) or 75' split over both East & West (Alt 6).

Segment 2 We are in favor of Alt. 15 = On 610 to Elysian/Hardy , this adds 4 managed lanes on 2 separate elevated structures on left and right sides of centerline with no increase of ROW. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT provides sound walls for noise abatement from elevated lanes including landscaping. On Hardy, it will require an additional 24' ROW and provide 2 additional lanes; 1 inbound & 1 outbound. Alt. 14- No additional ROW required on I-45. Existing roadway stays the same and a bored tunnel is added to carry 4 managed lanes within the I-45 ROW. Alt. 10 -No additional ROW required on I-45. The roadway that is below grade level is widened to include 4 managed lanes while staying within ROW. The roadway below grade level is covered with concrete beams for a solid surface at grade level. Includes two 15' outside bike lanes. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT converts this new surface area into usable green space and/or park land. We oppose Alt. 11 & 12 because these both require elevated structures for the managed lanes which will increase noise and sight pollution.

Segment 3 We are in favor of Alt. 4 = No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes from an extension of Elysian/Hardy at the North, goes under La Branch and Crawford and terminates at the US 59/SH 288 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to I-45. Alt. 5- No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Bagby and terminates at Spur 527. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT moves the tunnel further away from Historic Districts Avondale West, Audubon Place or First Montrose. We also want an exit to I-45. Alt. 6- No additional ROW required. This Alt. provides a bored tunnel which has 4 managed lanes that tunnels under I-45 then continues under Jefferson and terminates at I-45 south of the I-45/US 59 interchange. We like this Alternative ONLY if TxDOT adds an exit to US 59. We oppose Alt. 3 - converting Pierce Elevated and part of US 59 and I-10 into the world's largest round-a-bout would be a waste of time & fuel and would drive excess amounts of traffic to surface roads and neighborhoods. We oppose Alt. 7 - we do not want any tunnel going under or thru historic neighborhoods including Houston Avenue.

---

**W350**

**From:** mroberts48@comcast.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 12:18 AM

---

Marco Antonio Roberts  
mroberts48@comcast.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Regarding the NHHIP proposed projects, studies have shown that expansion projects on freeways actually promote more inefficiently placed developments along those same freeways, speeding up traffic growth, rendering the very expensive (and traffic-blocking) construction obsolete in just a few years. We can see that ourselves, with the still-young massive I-10 project already seeing congestion levels that are fast approaching the levels present right before the project began. And also, as long as the government is subsidizing car travel, more energy (and space) efficient mass transit options will never be truly viable. I favor no build, but if there must be a build, then I favor those that limit the need for Right-of-way expansion, limit obstruction to urban-friendly development. I would rather see taxes spent on rapid mass transit options for the citizens of Houston. A First World bullet train to the IAH would be nice, and bring us into the league of major world cities. I am also curious if any major private contractors have been lobbying for this project.

---

**W351**

**From:** tmerrick@pspaec.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 12:46 AM

---

tami merrick  
tmerrick@pspaec.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I oppose the expansion project. Basis of opposition is outdated data out dated practice of highway design. Inability to address public livability practices that other city tx dots have embraced. Hgac needs to wake up to 2012 concepts of design practice and transportation planning practices. I oppose wreckless expansion of I45.

---

**W352**

**From:** mikentx16@comcast.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 12:47 AM

---

Michael Alberts  
mikentx16@comcast.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I would agree that I-45 should be brought up to code at least for drainage purposes. However, before proceeding any further, I would urge you to look at the results of the expansion of I-10 from the I-610 loop to Katy. Has that significantly relieved traffic congestion along that freeway? I have heard that it is still very congested. I also see in the NHHIP Agency and Coordination Development Plan that none of the 5 build alternatives brings the V/C ratio below 1 except in one segment, and that is so close to 1 that it doesn't matter. Expanding capacity is just an invitation for more and more people to use it (if you build it, they will indeed come) until the capacity is again maximized. We need a better way to increase the mobility of the growing population of the city. Has any study been done for a commuter rail? Not a light rail, which travels on roadways, but a real commuter rail that has the right of way (will not need to worry about obeying traffic lights) with some express bus service at the stations along the route. This could provide a fast mode of transportation for people from the suburbs to downtown. You might even be able to convert existing HOV lanes on I-45 to rail use, which would enable the use of existing park and rides. I'm sure the greatest impediment to this is the cost, but if you think about it in the long term, to increase capacity on a commuter line only required adding some cars to the train vs. a lengthy construction period and high cost for adding lanes to freeways. In the long run, a commuter line may actually be cheaper in the long term (think over 20-30 years).

---

**W353**

**From:** sound@goowy.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 01:01 AM

---

Judy W  
sound@goowy.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

In response to the Improvement Project proposal, i, as a resident and tax-payer support option 14 or 15 for Segment 2; and option 4 or 5 for Segment 3. Having attended the public meetings, i strongly believe it is essential that TxDOT revisit the traffic data on hand before further decision should be reached. Not only is the congestion of today more than a decade apart from the year 2000 report used by the department, the urban landscape along this concerning corridor has evolved into a more dense and meaningful component of the city of Houston. Despite recent years of economic uncertainty, small businesses and residents have continued to devote hard work and monetary effort in revitalizing our community. This is especially evident in areas surrounding Houston Ave, where historic and cultural significance has been reconized formally by the city [i.e. the first and the sixth ward]. Regardless of the monstrous figure that is our nation's debt, the effect of spending over \$2,000,000,000 in taxpayer's money should be a huge responsibility. Not only could the outcome hinder current regeneration, decisions based on old methods and studies of last century could impact many lives and livelihood. Instead of 3 MPH improvement in general traffic lanes, i implore you to seriously consider the benefits in tunneling infrastructure - a method that has proven succesful in other parts of the country and the world. In addition to the current scheme, it seems rational to upgrade the current HOV setup into a two-lanes HOV diamond system. This cost conscious upgrade would provide a more immediate and effecient relieve until further developmet on this project is finalised and executed.

---

**W354**

**From:** Kathymgoodwin@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 01:39 AM

---

Kathy Goodwin, LMSW, JD  
Kathymgoodwin@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Hello, As a family with small children, we are opposed to the expansion of I45. Our small but blossoming neighborhood is already affected by traffic and congestion. We want to keep this neighborhood moving in the right direction towards progress. This old neighborhood has changed into a kid-friendly community.... There are so many kids running around and many families moving in to our little historic distinct. From a safety, environmental and community perspective, we are opposed to the proposed plans. After doing research, we discovered these plans are based on outdated data and assessment material. Please remember our families and our community going forward. Thank you from a concerned home owner and mother in the old sixth ward.

---

**W355**

**From:** stuandheidi@comcast.net  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date:** 11-10-2012 11:00 AM

---

Heidi Landen-Greene  
stuandheidi@comcast.net  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

Segment 2 I am IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I am opposed to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12

---

**W356**

**From:** Flickbass@yahoo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-10-2012 04:28 PM

---

Philip Smith  
Flickbass@yahoo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I think that spending over \$2 BILLION of taxpayer's money (in 2004 dollars) to get an improvement of only 3 MPH in general traffic lanes is a HUGE waste of money. In addition, TxDOT is using traffic data that is over 12 years old (from 2000) that probably does not reflect the current traffic situation we are facing today. I am against spending ANY money until TxDOT updates their traffic studies and determines cost-effective solutions to today's congestion. However, if TxDOT proceeds, the following alternatives are the best that have been proposed to minimize additional right-of-way (ROW) and protect neighborhoods and businesses. Segment 1: I-45 from Beltway to Loop 610 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 3 & 3c; 7 & 8. With Alternatives 7 & 8, TxDOT must provide noise abatement on all elevated structures to reduce increased noise levels. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 4, 5 & 6 because they require an additional 150' of ROW which would destroy or devastate existing businesses and/or homes. UPDATE – Alternative 7 requires 30' of additional ROW and Alternative 8 requires 25' of new ROW on each side of I-45. Several property owners on the East Side of I-45 have stated their strong preference for Alternative 4 which requires 150' of ROW from the West side. They have pointed out that there is a large amount of vacant property on the West side and much of that property floods. They are firmly in support of Alt 3 & 3c and Alternative 4 but do not support Alternative 7 or Alternative 8. Segment 2: I-45 from Loop 610 to I-10 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternatives 15, 14 & 10. I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 11 & 12 Segment 3: I-45 thru Downtown / Pierce Elevated / 59 I AM IN FAVOR of Alternative 4 (but TxDOT needs to add exit to I-45), Alt. 5 (TxDOT must move away from the Historic Neighborhoods & Alt. 6 (TxDOT needs to add exit to 59). I AM OPPOSED to Alternatives 3, 7 & 10.

---

**W357**

**From:** noreply@mladineo.com  
**To:** comments@ih45northandmore.com  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Date** 11-15-2012 08:23 PM

---

Fernando Mladineo  
noreply@mladineo.com  
Employed = False  
Business = False  
Benefit = False

I vote for the following alternatives: Segment 1 - Alt 7 Segment 2 - Alt 11 Segment - Alt 7, then Alt 3