

## 8.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Agency coordination and public involvement are crucial to the successful completion of transportation infrastructure projects. The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Corpus Christi District and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have engaged government agencies, key stakeholders, and the public in the planning process for the proposed US 181 Harbor Bridge Project. The proposed project has been open to comment regarding the scope, the need and purpose, proposed alternatives, environmental impacts, mitigation and other project-related information. TxDOT and FHWA have recorded and considered all comments received as of the date that this Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) has been issued, and will continue to consider all comments received in preparing the Record of Decision (ROD) for this project.

This section of the Final EIS documents the scoping, public, and agency coordination process, and includes the following:

- Notices of Intent;
- Coordination Plan;
- Public and Agency Scoping Meetings;
- Agency Coordination;
- Citizens Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meetings;
- Neighborhood Meetings;
- Stakeholder Meetings;
- Public Meeting;
- Public Hearing;
- Newsletter; and
- Project Website.

### 8.1 NOTICE OF INTENT

TxDOT and FHWA first published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register* on May 20, 2005 for the proposed improvements to US 181 at the Harbor Bridge. In that NOI, the US 181 Harbor Bridge Project was described as involving the replacement of the existing Harbor Bridge and approaches where US 181 crosses the Corpus Christi Ship Channel. The project limits were as follows:

- Northern limit: US 181 and Beach Avenue, north of the Corpus Christi Ship Channel but south of the Nueces Bay Causeway;
- Southern limit: SH 286/Crosstown Expressway between Morgan Avenue and Baldwin Boulevard;
- Eastern limit: I-37 and Shoreline Boulevard in the Corpus Christi Central Business District (CBD); and
- Western limit: I-37 and Nueces Bay Boulevard.

On March 20, 2007, a revised NOI was published to advise the public that the study limits described in the 2005 NOI had been expanded. The primary change was to the southern limit, which would have extended the project along SH 286/Crosstown Expressway to SH 358 (South Padre Island Drive). On November 3, 2010, the revised NOI published in 2007 was rescinded, via a notice in the *Federal Register*, because of changes in the scope (managed toll lanes) and project limits.

TxDOT and FHWA published a new NOI on June 22, 2011, in the *Federal Register* and on July 8, 2011, in the *Texas Register*. The NOI also was published in the *Corpus Christi Caller-Times* on July 10, 2011. As stated in the 2011 NOI, the project limits are as follows:

- Northern limit: US 181 and Beach Avenue, north of the Corpus Christi Ship Channel but south of the Nueces Bay Causeway;
- Southern limit: SH 286 (Crosstown Expressway) between Morgan Avenue and Baldwin Boulevard;
- Eastern limit: I-37 and Shoreline Boulevard in the CBD; and
- Western limit: I-37 and Nueces Bay Boulevard.

The NOI established the preliminary contents of the EIS, the required approvals by the federal government, details for scoping, and procedures expected for coordination and public involvement based on National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements. See **Appendix K** for a copy of the 2011 Harbor Bridge NOI.

## 8.2 PROJECT COORDINATION

In 2011, TxDOT and FHWA prepared a Project Coordination Plan to facilitate and document the Joint Lead Agencies' structured interaction with the public during the project development process. The plan also documents how this interaction and coordination would be accomplished. The Project Coordination Plan was prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users of 2005 (SAFETEA-LU) (23 USC §139), and was formally approved by FHWA in October 2011.

In the Project Coordination Plan, the Cooperating and Participating agencies for the proposed project are identified, along with their respective roles and responsibilities. Cooperating agencies are defined in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1508.5 as federal agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise pertaining to the proposed project. Participating agencies include local, state, and federal resource agencies with a special interest in the proposed project. The list of Cooperating and Participating agencies is found in **Table 8.2-1**.

### 8.2.1 Scoping Process

Public and agency scoping meetings were held on June 23, 2005, May 17, 2007, and on August 9 and October 27, 2011. Agency scoping was held to elicit information and comments from the Cooperating and Participating agencies about the development of the need and purpose for the proposed project;

identification of the boundaries of the study area; environmental and engineering constraints as well as known or potentially significant issues; process and methodologies for alternatives development and evaluation; the range of alternatives; and the proposed project schedule. In addition, agency scoping was used to gather agency input on the Project Coordination Plan and Need and Purpose Statement, and to answer questions about the proposed project. Meeting summaries for the 2005 and 2007 meetings are not included in this document since they apply to an earlier project scope and associated NOI; therefore, the meetings are not applicable to the current project. However, these summaries can be found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com). The 2011 scoping meeting summaries are included in **Appendix K**.

In January 2011, TxDOT and FHWA began the process of pre-scoping with the potential Cooperating and Participating agencies listed in the Project Coordination Plan. The objective of pre-scoping was to give agencies a head start on project scoping, which was intended to enable the scoping process to proceed more efficiently. Eleven agencies were sent letters asking whether they wished to participate in the proposed US 181 Harbor Bridge Project by participating in scoping meetings and reviewing documents. Their responses to this letter are documented in the Project Coordination Plan and are included in **Appendix B**.

Following the pre-scoping process, the formal scoping process was initiated on July 20, 2011. Scoping letters were sent to federal, state, and local agencies, Native American tribes, and other interested parties. As a result of the scoping process, three agencies agreed to be Cooperating agencies, 14 agencies requested to be Participating agencies, and two agencies requested to be interested parties (see **Table 8.2-1** and **Appendix B**). Responses to the scoping letters were not received from Native American Tribes; additional coordination with Native American Tribes was conducted under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

<b>Table 8.2-1 Participating and Cooperating Agencies</b>		
<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
<b>Federal Agencies</b>		
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Cooperating Agency	Review and comment on possible effects to air quality, under Section 309 of Clean Air Act, and water quality
U.S. Coast Guard (USCG)	Cooperating Agency	General Bridge Act of 1946 – bridge permit jurisdiction
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Cooperating Agency	Review and comment on possible effects to HUD-assisted and insured multifamily housing facilities
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Participating Agency	Section 404 Clean Water Act permit jurisdiction
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)	Participating Agency	Analysis of project effects on prime farmland, under Farmland Protection Policy Act

<b>Table 8.2-1 Participating and Cooperating Agencies</b>		
<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Participating Agency	Wildlife, habitat, and Threatened and Endangered Species, including Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act permit jurisdiction
National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Participating Agency	Review and comment on possible effect to marine fisheries in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006
National Park Service (NPS)	Participating Agency	Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program
<b>State Agencies</b>		
State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)	Participating Agency	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 USC 303)
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)	Participating Agency	Review project impacts to hazardous material sites, and compliance with the Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES); designated state representative for EPA
<b>Local Agencies</b>		
City of Corpus Christi	Participating Agency	Identification and resolution of project effects to parks and areas within the city limits and area of extraterritorial jurisdiction
City of Portland	Participating Agency	Identification and resolution of any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environment effects within the City's jurisdiction
San Patricio County	Participating Agency	Identification and resolution of any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environmental effects within the County's jurisdiction
Corpus Christi Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)	Participating Agency	Proposed project with respect to Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Transportation Improvement Program. Identification of issues relating to safety and mobility, system interconnectivity, and project effects to minority and low income populations
Port of Corpus Christi	Participating Agency	Identification of issues related to the Corpus Christi Ship Channel and Port properties including shipping, safety and commerce

<b>Table 8.2-1 Participating and Cooperating Agencies</b>		
<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
Coastal Bend Council of Governments	Participating Agency	Identification of planning and coordination of issues relative to local governments
Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Authority (RTA)	Participating Agency	Identification of issues related to public transportation relative to the cities and counties in the RTA
<b>Other Interested Parties</b>		
Historic Bridge Foundation	Interested Party	Comment on impacts to historic bridges
Citizens for Environmental Justice	Interested Party	Expressed interest in Participating in the project. Group has a particular interest in air quality in neighborhoods adjacent to the refineries.

Source: US 181 Harbor Bridge EIS Team 2013

#### *8.2.1.1 Public Scoping Meetings*

Scoping for the proposed US 181 Harbor Bridge Project included two agency/public scoping meetings on August 9, 2011, and October 27, 2011, as well as agency/public scoping meetings associated with previous NOIs, which were held on June 23, 2005, and May 17, 2007.

The meetings served as a forum for disseminating information about the project and for obtaining public input on the scope of issues to be addressed during the preparation of the EIS. Specifically, these scoping meetings gave the community an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed Project Coordination Plan, the Need and Purpose Statement, the range of alternatives, the alternatives evaluation process, and other project information. Each meeting began with an open house session during which project team members interacted with meeting participants to answer questions and listen to participants' opinions and concerns about the project. The materials distributed at these meetings generally consisted of a project fact sheet, a map of the project area, comment forms, and newsletters. The following displays were available for viewing: map showing project and study limits; an environmental constraints map; an aerial map showing possible project corridors; and typical sections. The open house portion of the meeting was followed by a presentation and comment session. The meetings were followed by a 30-day comment period and a scoping meeting summary report was prepared for each meeting. Materials from the public scoping meetings are on the project website ([www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com)).

#### August 9, 2011

As specified by SAFETEA-LU, this first scoping meeting after the publication of the 2011 NOI provided resource agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public an opportunity to review and provide comments on the draft Project Coordination Plan, which includes the Need and Purpose Statement, and an explanation of the methodology of analysis and level of detail for the alternatives analysis.

A public notice of the August 9, 2011, public scoping meeting was published on August 4, 2011, in the *Corpus Christi Caller-Times* and on August 4, 2011, in the *Portland News*. Both the *Caller-Times* and the *Portland News* ran news stories on the scoping meeting. The project newsletter, which contained a notice about the meeting, was mailed to the project mailing list of about 450 individuals. The meeting also was advertised on local community calendars and on the project website.

A total of 76 individuals (including 11 TxDOT staff members and other project team members) registered their attendance at the public scoping meeting, which was held from 5:30 – 8:00 p.m. at the TxDOT Corpus Christi District Office located at 1701 South Padre Island Drive in Corpus Christi. Twelve people spoke at the meeting and another nine people submitted written comments. Comments included support for bicycle/pedestrian facilities on the proposed bridge, support for the Red Alternative, support for preserving cohesion of Uptown and Downtown Corpus Christi, concern for the high costs of the new bridge, general concerns about the new bridge, and the suggestions that TxDOT consider a tunnel as a replacement of the Harbor Bridge as well as an alternative to the west of the existing proposed alternatives.

Comments from the meeting were documented and addressed by the project team in the Scoping Meeting Summary Report (see **Appendix K**). As a result of the public scoping meeting, the design team added the Tunnel Alternative and the West Alternative to be considered in the Draft EIS document.

#### October 27, 2011

The second scoping meeting, held on October 27, 2011, at the Solomon Ortiz Center at 402 Harbor Drive in Corpus Christi, covered the revised draft Coordination Plan, including the revised Need and Purpose statement, the range of alternatives, including new alternatives suggested by the agencies and the public, and the methodology and level of detail for the alternatives analysis. Again, the meeting participants had an opportunity to review the information presented and provide comments. Public notice of the meeting was published in the *Corpus Christi Caller-Times* on October 13, October 20, and October 26, 2011, and in the *Portland News* on October 13 and October 20, 2011. TxDOT also distributed a press release and a postcard announcing the public scoping meeting was sent to individuals on the Harbor Bridge mailing list. A meeting notice was also posted on the project website. A news story on the scoping meeting ran on October 28, 2011, in the *Caller-Times*.

A total of 37 individuals (including three project team members) registered their attendance at the public scoping meeting, which ran from 4:30 – 8:00 p.m. Four elected officials or representatives of elected officials signed in as well.

At this meeting, two new proposed alternatives were introduced: the West Alternative and the Tunnel Alternative, both based on comments submitted by the public at the August 2011 public scoping meeting. Eleven individuals spoke at the meeting and six individuals and/or organizations submitted written comments. Comments included the need to prioritize environmental justice considerations, concern about security issues associated with the Blue Alternative, need for early public

communications, need to understand how proposed alternatives will be evaluated, and support for the Red Alternative (see **Appendix K**).

#### 8.2.1.2 Agency Scoping Meetings

Agency scoping meetings were held on August 9, 2011, and October 27, 2011, on the same dates as the public scoping meetings, as well as on June 23, 2005, and May 17, 2007. The meetings served as a forum for disseminating information about the project and for obtaining public input on the scope of issues to be addressed during the preparation of the Draft EIS. Specifically, these scoping meetings gave agencies an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed Project Coordination Plan, the Need and Purpose Statement, the range of alternatives, the alternatives evaluation process, and other project information. The meetings followed a similar format as the public scoping meetings, structured with a meet and greet session followed by a presentation and allocated time for questions and comments. All comments were recorded and addressed by the project team. Meeting summaries for the 2005 and 2007 meetings are not included in this document but can be found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com).

#### August 9, 2011

TxDOT and FHWA held an agency scoping meeting on August 9, 2011, from 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. at the TxDOT Corpus Christi District office. Twenty-four agencies and Native American tribes were invited to the scoping meeting with a formal letter sent approximately a month before the meeting. Twenty-one agency representatives attended the meeting. The following agencies were represented:

- City of Corpus Christi
- City of Portland
- Corpus Christi Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Coastal Bend Council of Governments
- Port of Corpus Christi
- Regional Transit Authority
- San Patricio County
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)
- General Services Administration (GSA)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Coast Guard
- Former U.S. Federal Judge Hayden Head (U.S. Courts)
- U.S. Marshall's Office

Ten agency representatives made verbal comments at the meeting and two representatives submitted written comments. Comments addressed the following topics:

- General bridge permit required for new bridge;
- Section 4(f) concerns;

- Concerns regarding the Blue Alternative;
- Projected completion date of EIS and ROD;
- City of Corpus Christi's ability to attract funding for proposed project;
- Independent utility of project;
- Current condition of bridge;
- Design of proposed new bridge;
- Time needed to determine preferred alternative;
- Need for local entities' support in moving the project forward;
- The effect of proposed bridge traffic on local air quality; and
- Coordination Plan comments (from the EPA).

### October 27, 2011

The second agency scoping meeting, held on October 27, 2011, at the Solomon Ortiz Center, covered the revised draft Coordination Plan, including the revised Need and Purpose statement, the range of alternatives, including the Tunnel and West Alternatives suggested by the agencies and the public, and the methods and level of detail.

Twenty-four agencies and Native American tribes were invited to the scoping meeting with a formal letter sent approximately a month before the meeting. Eight agency representatives attended the meeting. The following agencies were represented:

- City of Corpus Christi
- San Patricio County (County Judge)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

One agency representative made a verbal comment at the meeting and two representatives submitted written comments. Comments include the following: need to move project forward more quickly, and support for the Red Alternative.

## **8.2.2 Agency Coordination**

During the completion of the EIS, agency coordination took place to gather input and information from agencies with jurisdictions relevant to the proposed project. This input was valuable to TxDOT and FHWA during analysis of proposed alternatives and the development of mitigation.

### *8.2.2.1 Cooperating Agency Coordination*

Three Cooperating agencies were identified from the scoping process: EPA, USCG, and HUD. The Cooperating agencies received a preliminary Draft EIS for early review. Comments received were documented and addressed in the Draft EIS to the extent possible. On July 24, 2013, TxDOT met with the EPA in the Dallas, Texas office to discuss environmental justice concerns, air quality regulations, and to address comments received by EPA in early 2013. On July 24, 2013, TxDOT and FHWA also met with HUD to discuss the updated Project Coordination Plan and the accelerated schedule for the project. On



September 9, 2013, TxDOT met with HUD in Corpus Christi, where the group participated in a project field visit. TxDOT met with the USCG on September 13, 2013. TxDOT and FHWA also held a workshop with HUD on November 6, 2013 to review the Draft EIS and facilitate the submittal of comments on the document.

During preparation of the Final EIS, TxDOT and FHWA met with EPA representatives three times (August 12, 2014, September 11, 2014, and October 22, 2014) to discuss comments submitted by EPA on the Draft EIS as well as the responses to those comments prepared by TxDOT and FHWA. During these meetings, the three agencies also reviewed and discussed the environmental justice mitigation proposed to minimize or offset adverse impacts to minority and low-income communities. A fourth meeting with the three agencies took place on November 6, 2014 to further discuss environmental justice issues and mitigation, including the Community Sustainability Plan, and to prepare for a neighborhood workshop scheduled for December 2014. TxDOT and FHWA also met with HUD representatives on August 19, 2014 to discuss comments submitted by HUD on the Draft EIS and the responses prepared by TxDOT and FHWA. A HUD representative also participated in the October 22, 2014 meeting that included EPA, TxDOT, and FHWA.

In addition to these meetings with Cooperating Agencies, TxDOT and FHWA participated in a Livability Summit sponsored by FHWA on October 15, 2014 in Corpus Christi. During that one-day summit, a TxDOT representative summarized the proposed environmental justice mitigation measures, including the Community Sustainability Plan.

#### *8.2.2.2 Resource Agency Coordination*

Coordination efforts with resource-based agencies included meetings with Coastal Bend Bays and Estuaries Program (CBBEP), USFWS and TPWD were scheduled to seek guidance from the agencies regarding ecology concerns in the project area. The first meeting was held on March 6, 2013 with a representative from the CBBEP in Corpus Christi. The purpose of the meeting was to acquire clarification and additional information on the listed and candidate avian species in the project area. A second meeting was held on March 7, 2013, with USFWS, TPWD, and TxDOT in Corpus Christi. The meeting was held to discuss potential project impacts to natural resources and to gain additional information on rare, listed, and candidate species potentially occurring in the project area.

#### **8.2.3 Citizens Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee**

The Harbor Bridge Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed and met on October 20, 2007, in two locations: Corpus Christi and Portland so as to reach interested individuals and stakeholders on both sides of the Harbor Bridge. Since these meetings took place under a previous NOI, summaries of these meetings are not included in this document, although they are available on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com). After a new NOI was issued in 2011, TxDOT and FHWA determined that it would be more appropriate to have both a CAC and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to ensure that all facets of the community are represented. Therefore, after the 2011 NOI was published, TxDOT and FHWA reactivated the CAC and formed a new TAC. Three meetings of the current CAC and

TAC were held in 2012 on January 11, June 21, and October 18. The CAC and TAC met on July 11, 2013, and January 9, 2014. The CAC met again on July 8, 2014.

Members of the CAC were recruited from neighborhoods adjacent to the proposed project and include neighborhood property owners, residents, business owners, service providers, and advocacy groups. Potential CAC members could nominate themselves or be nominated by others. TxDOT/FHWA made the final decisions regarding CAC membership based on a process that included considering a target size for the committee (up to 30 members) and the following criteria for individual members:

- Broad representation of stakeholder interests;
- Diversity;
- Geographical representation within the project area;
- Demonstrated interest in the Harbor Bridge project; and
- Willingness to make time commitment needed for CAC participation.

The mission of the CAC is as follows:

- To receive project team reports on the progress of the project in relationship to established schedules and project milestones;
- To promote public awareness and understanding of the project; and
- To advise TxDOT/FHWA on the community's preferences regarding the project as well as the best approach for communicating with the public.

TAC members are individuals who either have a particular interest or expertise related to the proposed project, and include elected officials, and representatives of local Participating agencies (e.g., the City of Corpus Christi, the Port of Corpus Christi), as well as business organizations, the educational community, and civic organizations.

Potential TAC members could nominate themselves or be nominated by others. TxDOT/FHWA made the final decisions regarding TAC membership based on a process that included considering a target size for the committee (up to 30 members) and the following criteria for individual members:

- Broad representation of stakeholder interests;
- Diversity;
- Demonstrated interest in the Harbor Bridge project;
- Professional experience in the technical areas applicable to the project; and
- Willingness to make the required time commitment for TAC participation.

The mission of the TAC is as follows:

- To review and monitor environmental studies and engineering products;
- To provide feedback to TxDOT/FHWA;
- To promote public awareness and understanding of the project;

- To share information learned at TAC meetings with others in their field and to bring back to TAC meetings any feedback received as a result of this information sharing; and
- To assist TxDOT in identifying environmental impacts and mitigation strategies for those impacts.

The format of the CAC and TAC meetings has evolved from a presentation/discussion session to a more interactive, facilitated session at the request of the CAC and TAC members.

### *8.2.3.1 CAC Meetings*

#### January 11, 2012

The January 11, 2012, CAC meeting was held from 6:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center located at 1414 Martin Luther King Drive in Corpus Christi. Approximately 14 CAC members were in attendance.

The agenda for the meeting included the following discussion topics:

- Project status;
- Project Need and Purpose;
- Alternatives evaluation process, and
- Public involvement activities for the project.

During the meeting, CAC members raised questions about the project's progress and an update on the Draft EIS documentation process, given that a scoping process had taken place during 2011. Meeting participants requested estimates of the total cost of bridge construction, asked FHWA and TxDOT to consider the effects of alternatives on nearby neighborhoods, and asked about right of way acquisition, among other topics. TxDOT responded to all questions during the meeting and these responses are documented in the meeting summary in **Appendix K**.

CAC members had various suggestions for public involvement strategies during the Draft EIS documentation, including effective ways of advertising public meetings (e.g., running public service announcements on radio or TV), using social media, and creating project visualizations. Several CAC members requested that future CAC meetings not be held on Wednesdays based on several schedule conflicts for members of the committee (this request was accommodated in subsequent meetings).

More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary available on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

#### June 21, 2012

The June 21, 2012, CAC meeting was held from 6:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Approximately 14 CAC members were in attendance.

The agenda for the meeting included the following discussion topics:

- Review of proposed project Need and Purpose;
- Review of evaluation of project alternatives (including elimination of the Tunnel and Blue Alternatives because they did not meet the project Need and Purpose);
- Status of Project;
- Status of Community Impact Assessment; and
- Public involvement.

The format of the meeting included a brief presentation followed by a facilitated discussion. The discussions among CAC members covered the NEPA process, project schedule, opportunities for public comment, and T.C. Ayers Park, among other topics. More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary that can be found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) or in **Appendix K**.

#### October 18, 2012

The October 18, 2012, CAC meeting was held from 6:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Approximately 16 CAC members were in attendance.

The meeting agenda consisted of a review of project status, a review/group discussion of the preliminary designs for the four proposed build alternatives, and an overview of upcoming public involvement activities. The meeting format consisted of facilitated group discussions of each of the four alternatives based on a review of the preliminary alternatives. To guide discussion, CAC members were asked to consider the effect that each proposed alternative might have on their neighborhood, and their preference for any particular alternative.

In general, CAC members viewed the Green Alternative as having both positive and negative impacts. They also saw the Red Alternative in a positive light. CAC members raised both positive and negative issues associated with the Orange Alternative, which generally was considered to be less favorable than the Red Alternative. In general, CAC members considered the West Alternative to be the least desirable of the four alternatives. More detailed information is documented in a meeting summary that can be found at the project website ([www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com)) and in **Appendix K**.

#### July 11, 2013

The July 11, 2013, CAC meeting was held from 6:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Approximately 15 CAC members were in attendance.

The meeting agenda consisted of an overview of project status, a review/group discussion of the revised preliminary designs, and a review of upcoming public involvement activities. The preliminary designs were modified to provide additional access for local drivers and to avoid Section 4(f) parks and historic properties. The meeting format consisted of a brief update on the status of the project and facilitated

group discussions of each of the four proposed alternatives (July 2013) that had been revised since December 2012. To guide discussion, CAC members were asked what they noticed about the revised designs and how these design changes would affect their neighborhood and Corpus Christi.

CAC members generally noted that the Red Alternative would provide benefits such as better connectivity for surrounding neighborhoods and the downtown area and drawbacks such as possible new congestion on I-37 frontage roads. During the group discussions, some CAC members indicated that they liked the revised preliminary design for the Orange Alternative (July 2013). CAC members saw the West Alternative as having the fewest benefits. They noted that the Green Alternative had a number of benefits including maintenance of existing traffic and street patterns, better ramps to I-37, and fewer community impacts.

More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary that can be found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

#### January 9, 2014

The January 9, 2014, CAC meeting was held from 6:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Approximately 17 CAC members were in attendance, along with six members of the public.

The meeting agenda consisted of a summary of the key findings of the Draft EIS; a discussion of the Recommended Alternative; a discussion of the proposed park improvements (Section 4(f) mitigation); a discussion of the proposed Environmental Justice mitigation; a discussion of the remainder of the project activities; and finally a discussion of public involvement activities to be held in the subsequent months, including neighborhood meetings, storefront meetings, and the Public Hearing.

The meeting format consisted of a brief update on the status of the project and facilitated group discussions of the Recommended Alternative. CAC members were divided into four separate groups to review and discuss the Recommended Alternative, 4(f) park mitigation, and the proposed mitigation for impacts to minority and low-income neighborhoods. Many CAC members supported the Recommended Alternative, although some stated a preference for the Green Alternative. Those who liked the Red Alternative (Recommended) noted that it seemed to be the best overall for the community as well as for the Northside; had less impact on parks and historic resources than previous versions; would have fewer environmental impacts than previous versions; and offered opportunities for redevelopment. The CAC had mixed reactions to the proposed park mitigation and felt that the proposed Environmental Justice mitigation measures were somewhat vague and needed to be described in more detail with additional community input.

More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary that can be found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

### July 8, 2014

The July 8, 2014, CAC meeting was held from 6:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Sixteen CAC members were in attendance, along with 13 members of the public.

The meeting agenda consisted of a summary of the current project status including public involvement; a group discussion of proposed Environmental Justice mitigation; and a group discussion of community preferences for the look and feel of the areas around and under the proposed new bridge (context sensitive solutions).

After a review of the proposed mitigation, CAC members were divided into four separate groups to review and discuss the proposed mitigation for impacts to minority and low-income neighborhoods, as well as context sensitive solutions. Committee members were reminded the group that they had already seen a conceptual mitigation plan and the proposed park mitigation actions at the previous CAC meeting, at the public hearing, and at neighborhood open houses. However, that conceptual mitigation plan had since been updated with community input and would be revised again with the input received at this CAC meeting.

Table discussions were followed by simultaneous polling to determine individual preferences on the various types of proposed mitigation. Committee members generally were supportive of proposed mitigation that addressed livability, recreational enhancements, aesthetic enhancements, workforce support, and traffic noise abatement.

The final portion of the meeting was a discussion of context sensitive solutions—the look and feel of areas under and around the proposed project. After a presentation on possible landscaping, architectural elements, and other aesthetic features, CAC members were asked to complete a short survey to express their preferences.

More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary that can be found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

### *8.2.3.2 TAC Meetings*

#### January 11, 2012

The January 11, 2012, TAC meeting was held from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Approximately 25 TAC members were in attendance.

The agenda for the meeting included the following discussion topics:

- Project status;
- Project Need and Purpose;

- Alternatives evaluation process; and
- Public involvement activities for the project.

During the meeting discussions, TAC members requested clarification related to how Measures of Effectiveness are determined and used during the alternatives analysis process. TxDOT representatives explained in detail how these measures were used—refer also to **Section 2.1.3**—to see if alternatives met the project Need and Purpose. Several TAC members expressed their desire to see the project move forward more rapidly and emphasized the importance of the bridge for communities on both its north and south sides. A few individuals indicated their disapproval of the Tunnel Alternative. TAC members also expressed ideas about engaging the community during the project and stressed the need for consistent messages.

More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

#### June 21, 2012

The June 21, 2012, TAC meeting was held from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Approximately 20 TAC members were in attendance.

The agenda for the meeting included the following discussion topics:

- Review of proposed project Need and Purpose;
- Review of evaluation of project alternatives (including elimination of the Tunnel and Blue Alternatives because they did not meet the project Need and Purpose);
- Status of Project;
- Status of Community Impact Assessment; and
- Public involvement.

The format of the meeting was a facilitated discussion following a brief presentation. The discussions among TAC members covered the following topics: need for robust public involvement; effects of proposed project on community cohesion; concerns about the safety and security of the West Alternative; importance of the aesthetics of a new bridge; and preference for the Red Alternative (Recommended).

More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

#### October 18, 2012

The October 18, 2012, TAC meeting was held from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Approximately 13 TAC members were in attendance.

The meeting agenda consisted of a status report on the project, a review/group discussion of preliminary designs, and a brief overview of upcoming public involvement activities, including the public meeting. The meeting format consisted of facilitated group discussions of the Green, Red, Orange and West Alternatives based on a review of the preliminary design drawings. To guide discussion, TAC members were asked to consider the effect that each proposed alternative might have on their neighborhoods, and their preference for any particular alternative. Preservation of pedestrian facilities was emphasized for all the alternatives.

In general, the Green Alternative was not viewed as an improvement to the transportation facility from a planning perspective. The alternative is viewed as less favorable compared to the other alternatives. In general, TAC members viewed the Red Alternative (Recommended) in a positive light, noting that this alternative would offer new opportunities for economic development and different land uses in the entertainment district. TAC members raised both positive and negative issues associated with the Orange Alternative, which generally was considered to be slightly less favorable than the Red Alternative. In general, TAC members considered the West Alternative to have the most negative effects and to be the least desirable of the four alternatives. They cited safety, access, and environmental issues.

More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

#### July 11, 2013

The July 11, 2013, TAC meeting was held from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Approximately 15 TAC members were in attendance.

The meeting agenda consisted of a brief project update, a review/group discussion of revised preliminary designs, and a brief overview of upcoming public involvement opportunities. The meeting format consisted of facilitated group discussions of each of the four alternatives based on a review of the preliminary design drawings (July 2013) that had been revised since December 2012. To guide discussion, TAC members were asked what they noticed about the revised designs and how these design changes would affect their neighborhood and Corpus Christi.

TAC members indicated the Green alternative had both positive and negative impacts associated with it. As a result of their facilitated discussions, TAC members identified benefits and a few drawbacks associated with the Red Alternative (Recommended). The Orange Alternative was the second favorite option for at least one of the TAC members. For others, the drawbacks of this alternative were predominant. TAC members considered the West Alternative to have more drawbacks than benefits.

More detailed information on this meeting is documented in a meeting summary found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.



### January 9, 2014

The January 9, 2014, TAC meeting was held from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. Seventeen TAC members were in attendance as well as six members of the public.

The meeting agenda consisted of a summary of the key findings of the Draft EIS; a discussion of the Recommended Alternative; a discussion of the proposed park improvements (Section 4(f) mitigation); a discussion of the proposed Environmental Justice mitigation; a discussion of the remainder of the project activities; and finally a discussion of public involvement activities to be held in subsequent months, including neighborhood meetings, storefront meetings, and the Public Hearing.

Overall, there was general agreement among TAC members that the Red Alternative is appropriate as the Recommended Alternative for replacement of Harbor Bridge. A few people believed that this alternative needs some fine tuning. They liked the idea of an iconic new bridge and the shared use path for bicyclists and pedestrians, and the fact that a new bridge alignment would allow for SEA District redevelopment and redevelopment in Hillcrest, as well as the fact that this alignment offers better accessibility to downtown Corpus Christi from Portland than currently exists.

TAC members generally supported the proposed park mitigation measures, particularly those at Ben Garza Park. They noted that it would be good to have a one-to-one substitution of new park acreage for any park land that might be taken by the new bridge. Generally, committee members did not think the proposed Environmental Justice mitigation was appropriate or defined well enough for discussion at this time.

#### **8.2.4 Neighborhood Meetings**

In the fall of 2012, a total of eight neighborhood meetings were held in the project area. Venues included churches, public facilities, and recreation centers in the Portland, North Beach, South Central, Northside, Westside and Refinery Row communities (see **Table 8.2-2** for a summary and **Figure 3.5-4** for a map of these communities). The purpose of the neighborhood meetings was to engage community members in the project, and to gather their expertise and opinions regarding their communities. Various efforts for advertising the meetings were made throughout each neighborhood. For each neighborhood meeting, post cards were mailed to all the residents within the zip code in which the meeting was held. Posters were placed at bus stops and local businesses, such as restaurants, laundromats, and public facilities. Flyers were sent home with students in the schools in parent packets. Each poster/flyer contained information including the date and location of the meeting, the website address, and information regarding future meetings. Some of the outreach materials were prepared in Spanish and English.

Approximately 160 community members participated in the neighborhood meetings. The meetings were held in the evenings in facilities within close proximity to residents of the community. The neighborhood meetings consisted of an introductory meet and greet session where attendees viewed the provided maps of the build alternatives to identify any key components of the build alternatives as

well as historic aerial photographs displaying some neighborhoods pre-I-37 construction. Formats for the meetings varied, but generally included a brief summary of the status of the project, followed by a question and answer session. Comments were recorded and addressed by the project team. The neighborhood meetings provided a perspective from the local residents on the impact the build alternatives would have on their daily lives. The comments received led to alterations to the build alternatives to reduce impacts to the community.

Attendees were asked to complete a community survey (see **Appendix F**) requesting the residents to identify facilities utilized by the particular neighborhood, and other concerns related to community cohesion. The survey was provided in English and Spanish. Brochures were provided to attendees detailing future dates related to public meetings, the link to the website to find the community survey, and a brief status update of the project. For each community meeting, a member of the project team was available to answer any questions in Spanish. Community meeting summaries are provided in **Appendix K**.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Community</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Number of Attendees</b>
September 20, 2012	North Beach	The Breakers Condominiums to the Corpus Christi North Beach Associations	25
October 15, 2012	Northside	St. Paul United Methodist Church	30
October 23, 2012	South Central	Kelsey Memorial United Methodist Church	15
November 5, 2012	Westside	Antonio E. Garcia Arts & Education Center	6
November 8, 2012	Northside	Oveal Williams Senior Center Members Lunch	30
November 8, 2012	Westside	Oak Park Elementary School	17
November 12, 2012	Portland	Portland Community Center	25
November 13, 2012	Refinery Row (Dona Park and Academy Heights)	St. Theresa Parish	8

Source: US 181 Harbor Bridge EIS Team 2013

In the fall of 2013, two community meetings were held to discuss park improvements proposed for mitigation of possible effects of the proposed build alternatives. On September 23 and 26, 2013, TxDOT and the City of Corpus Christi Parks and Recreation Department held two neighborhood meetings at the Oveal Williams Senior Center and at the Ben Garza Park gymnasium, respectively, to determine community reactions to proposed mitigation of 4(f) park properties in Corpus Christi. Meeting participants were asked for their reactions to proposed mitigations covering T.C. Ayers Park, Lovenskiold Park, Ben Garza Park, Dr. H.J. Williams Memorial Park, and the Rincon Channel Wetlands Interpretive Overlook, as well as to a proposed new park (Washington Park). Seventy individuals attended the two meetings and their reactions to proposed mitigation were generally positive. Some individuals requested enhancements to the proposed mitigation such as additional bathrooms, lighting, security, and parking for existing parks and proposed new park.

In January 2014, TxDOT and FHWA held eight neighborhood open houses in the project area to give local residents an opportunity to learn more about the Draft EIS and to offer comments on the project, the Recommended Alternative, and the EIS document. These open houses were held throughout the project area to make it easy for local residents to attend. The open houses were heavily publicized using direct mailers, the project newsletter, project website, and in flyers and posters distributed throughout the community.

<b>Table 8.2-3 Neighborhood Open Houses – 2014</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Community</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Number of Attendees</b>
January 14, 2014	Northside	St. Paul United Methodist Church 1202 Sam Rankin St.	12
January 15, 2014	Dona Park	Gibson Elementary School 5723 Hampshire Rd.	13
January 16, 2014	Portland	Portland Community Center 2000 Billy G. Webb Dr.	33
January 21, 2014	North Beach	Radisson North Beach 3200 Surfside Blvd.	24
January 23, 2014	Northside	Oveal Williams Senior Center Members Lunch 1414 Martin Luther King Dr.	17
January 27, 2014	South Central	Kelsey Memorial United Methodist Church 1610 Comanche St.	29
January 29, 2014	Westside	Oak Park Elementary 3801 Leopard St.	10
January 30, 2014	Westside	Antonio E. Garcia Arts & Education Center 2021 Agnes St.	13

Source: US 181 Harbor Bridge EIS Team 2014

Throughout the public comment period (January 3 – March 18, 2014), TxDOT held storefront meetings at the local public library (La Retama) and at the Oveal Williams Senior Center. A copy of the Draft EIS was available for review during these meetings. The meetings, which were held over the lunch hour at Oveal Williams and at 5 pm at the library, provided additional opportunities for individuals to talk with the TxDOT project managers and to ask questions and/or provide comments. During this same time period, TxDOT project managers made themselves available to the public at the TxDOT Corpus Christi District Office. Any individual could drop by, review the Draft EIS and ask questions and/or provide comments.

### **8.2.5 Stakeholder Meetings**

To maintain public involvement efforts as the project moved forward, several steps were taken to continue communication. TxDOT had expressed on many occasions their availability to meet with individuals, organizations, or other interested stakeholders to discuss the project at any time and continue to maintain an open door policy for any questions or comments. Throughout the course of the project, TxDOT continued to emphasize the importance of public input to ensure that all parties in the community were fairly represented.

**Table 8.2-4** below lists some of the stakeholder and small meetings with various organizations that have taken place. Three stakeholder meetings were held with business owners and developers in the Corpus Christi area on November 13, 2012. Representatives included the Port of Corpus Christi, the Texas State Aquarium, the USS *Lexington*, the SEA District, and two representatives from the restaurant industry in North Beach. The purpose of the stakeholder meetings was to have a discussion with local businesses owners regarding the four proposed alternatives in relation to their business. Feedback included a range of responses from community and economic impact to the City of Corpus Christi's long-term goals in relationship to the stakeholders. Discussion with the Port included current and future navigation trends. Comments from tourism industry representatives suggested the importance of separating truck traffic from other traffic and tourists, especially at the Beach Avenue exit. Emphasis was also placed on maintaining connectivity to the North Beach area with the downtown businesses. It was made clear that the North Beach tourism industry is dependent on the efficient access between downtown and North Beach.

A meeting was held with the Environmental Summit Environmental Justice Working Group on October 16, 2012, where several items were discussed among the members and attendees, including TxDOT staff. The Group focused the discussion primarily on efforts by the Port of Corpus Christi Authority to implement its Environmental Management System and improve its overall performance with regard to environmental compliance and pollution prevention. There was also discussion regarding the City of Corpus Christi's Local Emergency Planning Committee and its event notification and response service regarding local refineries. Concern from members was noted with respect to the ability of Port tenants to reduce the frequency of fugitive dust leaving their fencelines and entering adjacent neighborhoods, and regarding the issue of evacuation of disabled residents. TxDOT did provide an update on the project development and provided copies of the project community survey.

<b>Table 8.2-4 Stakeholder Meetings</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Number of Attendees</b>
November 11, 2011	Corpus Christi Beach Association	Breakers Condominiums, North Beach, Corpus Christi	20
February 8, 2012	Rotary Club of Southside Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi Country Club	40
March 22, 2012	Downtown Corpus Christi Kiwanis Club	Wells Fargo Bank Building, Corpus Christi	24
September 10, 2012	Texas A&M Corpus Christi	Technical Writing Class at Texas A&M Corpus Christi	20
September 17, 2012	City of Corpus Christi Transportation Advisory Committee Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee	City Hall, Corpus Christi	11
October 8, 2012	Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce Infrastructure Committee	Port of Corpus Christi	12
October 16, 2012	Citizens for Environmental Justice	Hillcrest Neighborhood	15
October 18, 2012	Corpus Christi MPO – Technical Advisory Committee	Regional Transportation Authority	10
November 2, 2012	Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce	Port of Corpus Christi	12

<b>Table 8.2-4 Stakeholder Meetings</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Number of Attendees</b>
	– Infrastructure Committee		
November 19, 2012	Association of General Contractors Local Chapter	Local Office	20
November 20, 2012	City of Corpus Christi – City Council	City Hall	20
May 2, 2014	Corpus Christi Independent School District	CCISD Administration Building	4
May 27, 2014	United Way of the Coastal Bend	United Way offices	5
June 3, 2014	St Paul United Methodist Church	Starbucks on Saratoga Blvd	4
June 6, 2014	Black Chamber of Commerce	Kinder Care	4
June 6, 2014	Hispanic Chamber of Commerce	Hispanic Chamber of Commerce office	4
June 23, 2014	Hillcrest Residents Association	TxDOT Corpus Christi Office	4

Source: US 181 Harbor Bridge EIS Team 2014

### **8.2.6 Public Meeting**

TxDOT and FHWA held a public meeting for the US 181 Harbor Bridge Project on December 4, 2012, from 5:00 - 8:00 p.m. at the Solomon Ortiz Center in Corpus Christi. A total of 139 individuals (five of whom were TxDOT employees) registered their attendance at the public scoping meeting. Ten elected officials or representatives of elected officials signed in as well.

The purpose of the meeting was to provide updated information and receive comments on the proposed project, including the Need and Purpose for the project and the preliminary schematic drawings for the four proposed build alternatives. The No-Build alternative was also discussed.

The meeting consisted of a one-and-one-half-hour open house followed by a TxDOT presentation and a public comment session. Displays showing the Green, Red, Orange, and West Alternatives, and the historic resources survey were available for review and comment. Visualizations of the proposed build alternatives were also on display. A project fact sheet, project location map, and comment card were given to each individual who signed in to the meeting. Project team members were available to interact with the public, local representatives, and answer questions. Members of the public were given an opportunity to deliver a verbal comment or leave a written comment.

Public notice of the meeting was published in the *Corpus Christi Caller-Times* on November 20, 2012, and December 2, 2012, and in the *Portland News* on November 28, 2012. In addition, meeting notices appeared in the *PennySaver* on November 28, 2012; in the *South Texas Catholic* on December 1, 2012; in the *Senior News* on December 1, 2012; and in Spanish in *El Tejano* on December 1, 2012. Radio spots advertising the meeting were run on Clear Channel Radio stations from November 26 – December 4, 2012. TxDOT also distributed a press release/media advisory and 100 posters advertising the meeting were distributed to 37 community and retail locations in the project area. In addition, a postcard

announcing the public meeting was sent to approximately 9,000 individuals living in zip codes in the project area and a newsletter that publicized the meeting was sent to the Harbor Bridge mailing list. A meeting notice also was posted on the project website.

Seven individuals delivered verbal comments at the meeting and one person dictated comments to the court reporter. No written comments were received. The verbal and dictated comments are documented in the Public Meeting Summary Report which can be found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

Public comments fell into the following general categories: access to downtown Corpus Christi; alternate methods of crossing the Corpus Christi Ship Channel; access problems at the northern limit of the proposed project; reasons for elimination of Blue Alternative; participation in neighborhood meetings; and total cost of the project.

### **8.2.7 Public Hearing**

A Public Hearing was held on February 18, 2014, to receive comments on the Draft EIS. The public comment period ran from January 3–March 18, 2014. About 300 individuals signed in at the public hearing and 69 written and oral comments were received from the public. In addition, TxDOT and FHWA received comments from seven Cooperating and Participating agencies. The hearing was heavily publicized through the local news media, project website, project newsletters, and via English/Spanish radio spots. The Public Hearing is summarized in detail in the Public Hearing Summary in **Appendix K**, which also contains all the of the public and agency comments received during the public comment period as well as responses to those comments.

### **8.2.8 Newsletters**

TxDOT created the newsletter, *News from the Bridge*, to communicate with the public about the proposed projects. Newsletters were published and distributed in April 2006, May 2007, July 2011, July 2012, November 2012, April 2013, January 2014, and September, 2014. These newsletters were mailed or emailed to a mailing list of about 550 and were distributed at public meetings and CAC/TAC meetings. Copies of the newsletters can be found on the project website at [www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com) and in **Appendix K**.

### **8.2.9 Project Website**

TxDOT created a website for the proposed project ([www.ccharborbridgeproject.com](http://www.ccharborbridgeproject.com)) and continues to update the site regularly. The site contains announcements of upcoming events, a project history, graphics and maps, and details on public involvement activities. The website includes a link for online completion of the community survey in both English and Spanish.

### 8.3 NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

The Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIS was published on January 3, 2014, in the *Federal Register*, the *Texas Register*, and the *Corpus Christi Caller-Times*. Prior to the issuance of the Draft EIS to the public, Cooperating agencies received a preliminary Draft EIS for review and comment. TxDOT and FHWA addressed these comments before publication of the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS also was distributed to federal, state, and local agencies, and parties of interest, and was made available to the public at the locations listed in the Distribution List provided at the end of this document. The Draft EIS was published on the US 181 Harbor Bridge website on January 3, 2014. Publication of the NOA began the public and agency comment period. This comment period originally extended from January 3, 2014 – March 3, 2014. After a public request, the comment period was extended to March 18, 2014. This extension was announced in the *Federal* and *Texas Registers* on March 7, 2014, and a notice of the extension was published in the *Corpus Christi Caller-Times* on March 2, 2014, and on February 27, 2014, in the *Portland News*.

This Final EIS considers the public and agency comments on the Draft EIS. This Final EIS has been issued by TxDOT and FHWA and released to the public with an NOA published in the *Federal Register*, the *Texas Register*, and the *Corpus Christi Caller-Times* and the *Portland News*, and on the US 181 Harbor Bridge Project website. Additional notification of the Final EIS has been sent to the project's distribution list of Cooperating and Participating agencies and interested parties. TxDOT and FHWA will consider comments on this Final EIS until a ROD is issued for the proposed project.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK