

## 2019 MTFP Amendment Public Comments

Comment #	Name	ZIP code	Amendment	Road Name	Support or Oppose	Comment
1	Jennifer Markey	77007	C	Crockett & Hogan	Support	Guy presenting did a great job!
2	Francisco Rodriguez	77007	C	Crockett & Hogan	Support	Very good
3	Silvia Rodriguez	77007	C	Crockett & Hogan	Support	Very Good :)
4	Nick Panzerella	77019	C	Crockett & Hogan	Support	Crockett is a neighborhood street & should be allowed to implement traffic calming measures.
5	Nick Panzerella	77019	D	West Gray	Support	Gray Street is wide enough, no need to give up more land to ROW.
6	Jack Passante	77019	D	West Gray	Oppose	Owens property at 160 & 164 W Gray. He has concerns that his land would be taken without compensation.
7	Robert P. and Gail H. Supina	77406	F	FM 359	Support	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>There is a drainage problem near the intersection of FM 359 and County road Fulshear-Gaston Rd. The public airport, Covey Trails X09, has been flooded on numerous occasions from nominal 3 and 4" rains. (photos available).</p> <p>Because Covey Trails is an aviation community, numerous houses, hangars and related pavement has reduced the Q factor since the last design by reducing the acreage available for absorption.</p> <p>There is a 7'x4' conduit installed under FM359 . Two 30" and one 24" pipes feed into that conduit which terminates in a 9'x4' conduit which drains under FM359.</p> <p>This design engineering was from 1947 and 1994.</p> <p>(State project # AR 543-2-42 pp 55-59)</p> <p>The problem is that the 9'x4' conduit simply drains into the 3' ditch along the south side of FM359, which slopes upward to the East, and a 30" culvert into the nursery property.</p> <p>We are requesting that when the redesign of FM 359 and Fulshear-Gaston Rd is undertaken, a conduit will be designed to carry all runoff from present and future development of Drainage areas 1 &amp; 3 directly to the nearest waterway Flewellen Creek along BR 114 (cf: State Project #543-2-42 p. 64) and not just emptied into the drainage ditch on the south side of the proposed road, which historically silts up over time.</p>
8	Chelsey Arnold	77004	G-2	Downtown/Midtown	Support	I believe the Houston roads are severely congested. With the amount of apts and new construction going up, I appreciate the proactive approach the city is providing.
9	Mary Robinson	77004	G-2	Downtown/Midtown	Support with Conditions	Support if it doesn't mean my front lawn will be taken away. I live on Elgin, part of the proposal to increase ROW. I'm concerned about the potential for losing part of my property, increased traffic, and decreased home value should a larger ROW be required on Elgin.

Comment #	Name	ZIP code	Amendment	Road Name	Support or Oppose	Comment
10	Terry Conn, PE		H-1	NS Collector	Support with Conditions	<p>I am the son-in-law of Maxine Schneider, and Mrs. Schneider owns 82.5 acres on the north and south side of Humble/future Holderrieth Road immediately east of Telge in Harris County. I am authorized to provide comments on this matter by Mrs. Schneider and she and my wife, Margaret, are copied on this email if any confirmation is needed.</p> <p>Mrs. Schneiders’ tracts are depicted by the lime green box below and Humble/Future Holderrieth Rd. is depicted with the red dashed line below. Also note that Suzette Snyder’s tract is depicted in the yellow box. I understand Ms. Snyder will be responding separately.</p> <p>Conditionally, Mrs. Schneider has no objection to the placement of the north-south Collector on the east side of her property north of Humble/Future Holderrieth. Our primary concern would be that the adjoining property owner to our east does not appear to be required to utilize any of their property for this connector. Our request would be, if possible, that the Commission/staff find some type of split such that the ROW required for new roadway, drainage, utilities sidewalks and related requirements be fairly shared between adjoining landowners/developers along this new connector, for us and continuing to the north so all parties share in the benefit and obligations associated with this amendment. There are different ways each landowner/developer/the County/possibly others can contribute to this overall cause as all of these tracts are platted and developed at some point, so we suggest that fairness be considered as appropriate in the location of the connector and which tracts will be required to contribute right of way and construct as some type of condition for plat approval.</p>
11	Suzette Snyder		H-1	NS Collector	Support with Conditions	As a follow up to the mail below, I share the same concerns identified by Mr. Conn. I would also appreciate the same consideration that the ROW be fairly shared between the adjoining landowners.