

## **Section 7: COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

---

Involvement and participation by community leaders, federal and state resource agencies, Native American tribes, and the public throughout the study process was an integral part of the I-69 project. The outreach program was specifically designed to address stakeholder concerns and encourage written comments. This section discusses these efforts from project initiation through the publication and distribution of the Draft EIS. Tables at the end of this section provide information on meeting locations, dates, and the approximate number of attendee (see Tables 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3). Minutes and attendance records of the meetings are on file at the DOTD. Agency, tribal and Local Official correspondence is included in the Appendix.

### **7.1 SCOPING PROCESS**

The objective of the scoping process was to identify environmental, socioeconomic, engineering or other issues that should be considered during the study. The local Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), local elected officials, federal and state resource agencies and Native American tribes were invited to participate in a series of meetings in May and June 2001. These meetings provided an opportunity for participants to gain an understanding of the Study Process, discuss project benefits and concerns, and identify key issues to be considered during alternatives

development. It was emphasized that early identification of environmental concerns maximized the ability to avoid and minimize impacts to these resources during alternatives development.

On July 20, 2000, a notice of intent was published in the Federal Register (Vol. 65, Number 140) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In April 2001, the DOTD initiated studies to prepare the EIS.

Solicitation of views and requests for relevant information concerning the study were sent to the resource agencies, Native American tribes and local officials and responses were received. These documents, along with all other agency correspondence are included in the Appendix.

#### **7.1.1 Metropolitan Planning Organization Involvement**

A scoping meeting was held with the Northwest Louisiana Council of Government's Transportation Planning Committee (Shreveport-Bossier City area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)) on May 4, 2001 at the DOTD District 04 office in Bossier City, Louisiana, to initiate early MPO involvement and cooperation in the study. The meeting presented an overview of the I-69 Study Process and the proposed Study Area, and discussed the transportation alternatives to be considered. The MPO indicated that only the Build Alternative satisfies, and is consistent with their

regional transportation plan. An April 27, 2001 Resolution adopted by the MPO supports the Build Alternative as the best possible solution to meet the transportation need (NLCOG 2001).

#### **7.1.2 Local Officials Involvement**

A scoping meeting was held with local officials on June 7, 2001 at the DOTD District 04 office in Bossier City, Louisiana. The meeting presented an overview of the Study Process and the proposed Study Area. Issues raised during the meeting included the desire for intermodal connectivity with the proposed highway, rail and the Port of Shreveport-Bossier, and the consideration of a future heavy rail line within the same transportation corridor. The Mayors of Stonewall and Haughton both indicated that their communities would benefit from the proposed highway but noted that residential and business impacts should be minimized to the extent possible.

#### **7.1.3 Resource Agency Involvement**

A scoping meeting was held with federal and state resource and regulatory agencies on June 6, 2001 in Shreveport, Louisiana to initiate early agency involvement and cooperation in the study. The objective of the meeting was to discuss the I-69 project Study Process and to identify key environmental issues to be considered during both the corridor and alignment phases of study. Issues identified and discussed included Federally listed threatened and endangered species, specifically the Interior least tern, Wetland Reserve Program

and Conservation Reserve Program areas, and wetland resources.

#### **7.1.4 Native American Tribal Involvement**

Representatives from the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, and the Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma were invited to participate in the June 6, 2001 agency scoping meeting to discuss the I-69 project Study Process and to identify any issues or areas of traditional religious and cultural importance that should be considered during both the corridor and alignment phases of study. No correspondence was received from any tribe identifying specific concerns, but the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma did request government-to-government coordination because of their prior predominant occupation of the Study Area.

A separate scoping meeting was held with the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma on November 2, 2001 in Binger, Oklahoma to discuss the I-69 project Study Process and any issues or areas of traditional religious and cultural importance that should be considered during both the corridor and subsequent alignment development. The Caddo Nation indicated that the archaeological sites on record at the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, Division of Archaeology were a good source of known Caddoan sites in the Study Area. The Tribe also indicated their desire to be consulted on Caddo Indian matters throughout the Study Process, especially during the Phase I

Cultural Resources Survey of the Preferred Alignment.

All tribal correspondence is included in the Appendix.

#### **7.1.5 Public Involvement**

Public scoping meetings were held in Haughton, Louisiana on June 6, 2001 and in Stonewall, Louisiana on June 7, 2001 to present an overview of the Study Process and the proposed Study Area and to receive comments on the project. Information on meeting dates, locations, times, and content was publicized through area newspapers. Project flyers announcing the meetings were also sent to local officials for posting in public places throughout the Study Area.

The Study Process flowchart and proposed Study Area map were displayed. The Study Area map used a DOTD parish highway mapping background to display the Study Area relative to the area road network.

The Study Process flowchart and Study Area map were distributed along with a comment form that requested environmental information, and proposed highway usage information. Approximately 200 people attended the public meetings and 35 comment forms were received. Public concern was the highway's potential proximity to and potential loss of personal property.

## **7.2 CORRIDOR STUDIES**

MPO, local official, resource agency, Native American tribe, and public involvement during the Corridor Studies phase focused on identifying a Preferred Corridor for the proposed highway. As discussed in Section 2, the objective of this study phase was to identify a corridor that provided the best opportunity to develop specific highway alignments within it that avoid and minimize overall project impacts.

### **7.2.1 Public Involvement**

Open forum public meetings were held in Haughton and Stonewall, Louisiana on December 11 and December 12, 2001, respectively. Information on meeting dates, locations, times, and content was publicized through area newspapers. Project flyers announcing the meetings were also sent to those on the project mailing list and to all local officials for posting in various business establishments throughout the Study Area. The public meetings allowed the public to review the corridor locations at their convenience and talk with project representatives.

The corridors were displayed in two formats. Both visually presented the environmental inventory information contained in the GIS and used for the corridor comparative analysis. Sensitive information such as endangered species locations and known archaeological sites were not displayed to the public. The first format used DOTD parish highway mapping background to display the

corridors relative to the area road network. The second used a 1998 and 1999 black and white aerial photograph background (approx. 1"=3,000') where land cover, timber and farming operations, and clusters of residential development were visible.

Several handouts including a corridor location map and comparative analysis table were distributed along with a comment form that requested additional environmental information, proposed highway usage information, and preferences on corridor locations. Approximately 200 people attended the public meetings and over 80 comment forms were received. Most comment forms favored either Corridor A or a combination of Corridors A, B or C. Public concern with all corridors was the proximity to and potential loss of personal property.

### **7.2.2 Local Officials Involvement**

The results of the corridor location study were presented to local officials on December 12, 2001 at the DOTD District 04 office in Bossier City, Louisiana. Individuals attending the meeting participated in discussions on the corridor locations, community and environmental concerns, and anticipated community benefits from the proposed project.

No specific corridor preference was identified at this meeting, although the general consensus preferred the corridors closer to the metropolitan area. Concerns included proximity to metropolitan

areas and the Port of Shreveport-Bossier, compatibility with existing rail lines, corridor preservation and project cost.

### **7.2.3 Agency Involvement**

Federal and state agencies were invited to participate in a December 11, 2001 agency coordination meeting to review the environmental inventory and the corridors developed. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) indicated that Corridor C appeared the most favorable, while Corridor D the least.

### **7.2.4 Native American Tribal Involvement**

Representatives from the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, and the Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma were invited to participate in the December 11, 2001 agency meeting to review the environmental inventory, the corridors developed, and to identify any issues or areas of traditional religious and cultural importance that should be considered during corridor evaluation and screening. No correspondence was received from any tribe identifying specific concerns.

## **7.3 ADDITIONAL CORRIDOR STUDIES**

### **7.3.1 Local Officials Involvement**

The MPO, the Mayor of Shreveport, the Mayor of Bossier City, the Port of Shreveport-Bossier, and the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) requested a January 30, 2002 meeting to further discuss the corridors developed and presented at

the December 2001 Corridor Studies meetings. The Mayors, the Port, and the Chamber requested that Corridor A be revised or a new corridor developed locating the project closer to Shreveport, Bossier City and the Port. The Mayor of Shreveport and the Chamber expressed concern about economic development and the loss of economic opportunities if the highway was located too far from the metropolitan area. The Mayor also indicated that the Lucas Sludge Disposal Site could be relocated, if necessary, to accommodate a highway corridor.

The Port also expressed concern about intermodal connectivity and indicated that the corridor could pass through their property in order to locate the highway closer to the City of Shreveport. The Port's stated position on utilizing their property differed from earlier Port correspondence.

Local officials were invited to participate in an April 2, 2002 local officials meeting to review the three additional corridors (Corridors E, F, and G) developed. Concerns continued to be proximity to metropolitan areas and the Port of Shreveport-Bossier, as well as potential compatibility with a future parallel rail corridor.

Following the April 2002 outreach meetings, the Port informed the DOTD that Corridors F and G pass through the largest contiguous tract of property owned by the Port. The Port expressed their desire to retain this tract for potential future

development. This information was not included with information previously provided by the Port on their existing infrastructure and planned infrastructure improvements, nor was the issue raised at the April 2002 outreach meetings.

A June 5, 2002 meeting was held with the MPO, the Mayor of Shreveport, the Mayor of Bossier City, and the Port of Shreveport-Bossier to discuss the Port properties with respect to potential future development, and the additional corridors developed. The Port indicated that the highway corridor could pass through their property, but that it would be limited to an approximate 2,000-foot width south of and adjacent to Corridors F and G.

The Mayor of Shreveport indicated that the local officials in attendance at the January 30, 2002 local officials meeting favored a corridor north of the Port (Corridor E) and that Corridor E was still favored by the local officials. A June 13, 2002 letter signed by the City of Shreveport, the City of Bossier City, the Caddo/Bossier Port Commission and the MPO stated continued support for Corridor E as the corridor preferred by the local governing authorities.

An October 30, 2002 meeting was held with the MPO's Transportation Policy Committee (see Table 7-4) to discuss shifts to Corridors F and G to address the Ports June 5, 2002 concerns and to discuss the corridor screening process. The shifted corridors were named Corridors F<sub>s</sub> and G<sub>s</sub>. The

Transportation Policy Committee agreed that a preferred corridor comprised of Corridor G<sub>S</sub> in its entirety along with a segment of Corridor B through the Red River Alluvial Valley, best balanced the environmental and engineering considerations with the benefits expected from the project. An October 30, 2002 Resolution adopted by the MPO supported this preferred corridor recommendation.

### **7.3.2 Public Involvement**

Additional open forum public meetings were held in on April 2 and April 3, 2002 in Haughton and Stonewall, Louisiana, respectively. Information on meeting dates, locations, times, and content was publicized through area newspapers. Project flyers announcing the meetings were, again sent to those on the project mailing list and to all local officials for posting in various business establishments throughout the Study Area. The public meetings allowed the public to review the Expanded Study Area and original and additional corridor locations at their convenience and talk with project representatives.

The corridors were displayed in two formats. Both visually presented the environmental inventory information contained in the GIS and used for the corridor comparative analysis. Sensitive information such as endangered species locations and known archaeological sites were not displayed to the public. The first format used DOTD parish highway mapping background to display the corridors relative to the area road network. The

second used a 1998 and 1999 black and white aerial photograph background (approx. 1"=3,000') where land cover, timber and farming operations, and clusters of residential development were visible.

Several handouts including a corridor location map and comparative analysis table were distributed along with a comment form that requested additional environmental information, proposed highway usage information, and preferences on corridor locations. Nearly 500 people attended the public meetings and over 40 comment forms were received. Public concern continued to be the proximity to and potential loss of personal property. Most comments favored Corridors A, B or E.

### **7.3.3 Agency Involvement**

Federal and state agencies were invited to participate in an April 2, 2002 agency coordination meeting to review the Expanded Study Area environmental inventory and the additional corridors developed. The FWS indicated that large forested tracts should be avoided due of the potential for Red Cockaded Woodpecker (RCW) habitat. No known RCW habitat has been documented in the Study Area. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) indicated that the Red River bridge location accommodates navigation concerns. The COE also indicated that frontage road and secondary and cumulative impacts be evaluated.

Following the June 5, 2002 meeting with the MPO, the Mayor of Shreveport, the Mayor of Bossier City, and the Port of Shreveport-Bossier, and the federal cooperating agencies were contacted to solicit additional comments on the additional corridors developed and presented at the April 2002 outreach meetings. Agency comments received are summarized below.

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – No additional comments beyond what has already been provided through previous project coordination.
- U.S. Coast Guard – Concerns are with navigation. If the Red River crossing is constructed with no piers in the water, then there are no concerns with the crossing location. If river piers are used, then the crossing location and angle, the pier locations, and fendering are important considerations.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – A preferred corridor should minimize wetland impacts. Corridors A, B, and E are too close to Wallace Lake and development of those corridors could be problematic. Cultural resource impacts should also be minimized and the Elm Grove Oil and Gas Field should be avoided, if possible.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – A preferred corridor should avoid or minimize wetland impacts consistent with Section 404 b(1). Potential secondary

development impacts, particularly in wetlands and floodplains should be considered and project cost is a valid evaluation criterion in identifying a preferred corridor. Corridor C appeared most favorable at the December 2001 outreach meetings and Corridor C is still a good selection. Corridors C, F and G have the least engineering issues. Corridor E has a higher likelihood for potential noise, neighborhood disruption, environmental justice, hazardous materials and relocation issues that could all be avoided by locating the highway further from the metropolitan area. A connector road could be provided for Port access. If a preferred corridor cannot be clearly identified, several corridors may need to be advanced for further study in order to quantify and qualify project impacts.

#### **7.3.4 Native American Tribal Involvement**

Correspondence inviting tribal participation at the April 2, 2002 agency coordination meeting was sent to the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, and the Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma. This letter requested the identification of any issues or areas of traditional religious and cultural importance that should be considered during the development of project alternatives. The FHWA also unsuccessfully attempted to contact the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma via telephone to solicit meeting participation. Messages left via answering machine

were not returned. No correspondence was received from any tribe identifying specific concerns.

Following the June 5, 2002 meeting, the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma was also contacted to solicit additional comments on the additional corridors developed and presented at the April 2002 outreach meetings. The Caddo Nation was contacted because of their prior predominant occupation of the Study Area. The Caddo Nation responded that any corridor containing or having the potential to contain Caddoan archaeological sites be avoided, if at all possible. If sites could not be avoided, then a plan should be developed in cooperation with the Caddo Nation to minimize and mitigate adverse effects to the sites and that a Memorandum of Agreement should also be developed stipulating the process for minimizing those effects. This correspondence is included in the Appendix.

### **7.3.5 Preferred Corridor Recommendation**

A Corridor Studies Report and Preferred Corridor recommendation was submitted in November 2002 to the federal cooperating agencies (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), the MPO, and other participating state and federal resource agencies. The corridor recommendation detailed the corridor study process, provided the rationale for the selection of the preferred corridor, and requested comments.

The federal cooperating agencies all concurred with the Preferred Corridor recommendation. No correspondence was received from any tribe identifying specific concerns.

## **7.4 ALIGNMENT STUDY**

The meetings held during the Alignment Study were designed to obtain specific comments from the meeting participants on the preliminary alignment locations. Attendance at these meetings was excellent and the comments received ultimately led to the identification of the Preferred Alignment presented in this document.

### **7.4.1 Public Involvement**

Public meetings were held in Stonewall and Haughton, Louisiana on July 22 and July 23, 2003, respectively. Information on meeting dates, locations, times, and content was publicized through area newspapers. Project flyers announcing the meetings were also sent to those on the project mailing list and to all local officials for posting in various business establishments throughout the Study Area. The public meetings included an open forum session in which the public had the opportunity to speak with project representatives and review the alignment locations. A short technical presentation and a question and answer period followed.

The alignments were displayed in two formats. Both visually presented the environmental inventory information contained in the GIS and

used for the corridor comparative analysis. Sensitive information such as endangered species locations and known archaeological sites were not displayed to the public. The first format used DOTD parish highway mapping background to display the alignments relative to the area road network. The second used a 1998 and 1999 black and white aerial photograph background (approx. 1"=3,000') where land cover, timber and farming operations, and residential and business development were visible.

Several handouts including an alignment location map and comparative analysis table were distributed along with a comment form requesting additional environmental information and opinions on the alignments presented that should be considered during alignment refinements.

Nearly 700 people attended the public meetings and nearly 100 comment forms were received. Of those comment forms received, 59 were from members of the Caddo Rifle & Pistol Club. Public concern continued to be the proximity to and potential loss of personal property. Most comments favored Line 2 or Line 3. Members of the Caddo Rifle & Pistol Club favored Line 3 in Section 3 because it was the farthest from the range and would not interfere with shooting activities.

#### **7.4.2 Local Officials Involvement**

Local officials were invited to participate in a July 22, 2003 local officials meeting at the DOTD District 04 office in Bossier City, Louisiana, to review the expanded environmental inventory and the preliminary alignments developed. No specific alignment preference was identified at the meeting.

In a separate letter, the Port expressed their support for an alignment crossing the Red River through Port property.

A meeting was held with the Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments, Transportation Planning Committee (Shreveport-Bossier City area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)) on January 20, 2004 to review alignment revision and development efforts since the July 2003 meetings. The MPO expressed their preference for an alignment resembling Line 5 in Section 1, Line 3 in Section 2, and Line 5 in Section 3. The MPO adopted a January 20, 2004 resolution supporting this alignment combination as the Preferred Alignment (NLCOG 2004).

In a separate February 17, 2004 letter, the Port expressed their continued support for an alignment crossing the Red River through Port property.

The FHWA, the DOTD, and the Caddo-Bossier Parishes Port Commission entered into an August 2004 Corridor Preservation Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to preserve Commission land, in an unimproved state, along the route of the

recommended preferred alignment subject to public, local officials, resource agency, and Native American tribe review and completion of the NEPA process. In the event that the alignment ultimately selected does not pass through Commission property, the MOA would terminate upon execution of the Record of Decision. The Corridor Preservation MOA is included in the Appendix.

#### **7.4.3 Agency Involvement**

Federal and state agencies were invited to participate in a July 23, 2003 agency coordination meeting to review the expanded environmental inventory and the preliminary alignments developed. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identified several areas where it may be possible to further minimize potential wetland impacts and requested that these areas be reevaluated. In a separate letter, the FWS suggested that habitat surveys be conducted for the Interior least tern (*Sterna antillarum*) and the Red-cockaded woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*) prior to selecting a preferred alignment.

A meeting was also held with representatives from the COE on August 19, 2003 to discuss the preliminary alignments, the potential wetland impacts, and field delineation methodology. The COE concurred with the field delineation methodology used.

#### **7.4.4 Native American Tribal Involvement**

Correspondence inviting tribal participation at the July 23, 2003 agency coordination meeting was sent to the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, and the Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma. These letters requested the identification of any issues or areas of traditional religious and cultural importance that should be considered during the alignment refinements. No correspondence was received from any tribe identifying specific concerns.

#### **7.4.5 Preferred Alignment Recommendation**

An alignment recommendation was submitted to the Federal cooperating agencies (COE, FWS, USCG, EPA) and the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma. The alignment recommendation detailed the alignment study process, provided the rationale for selecting the Preferred Alignment, and requested written comments. The COE and the EPA concurred with the Preferred Alignment recommendation. The USCG had no comments at this time. In their response, the FWS indicated that they could not concur with the Preferred Alignment recommendation until biological assessments of the potential effects to Federally listed endangered species were completed. At a January 25, 2005 meeting, the DOTD, the FHWA, and the FWS agreed that biological assessments for the interior least tern (*Sterna antillarum*) and red-cockaded woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*) would be conducted and that the Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 consultations with the FWS would

be completed prior to the issuance of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The Caddo Nation of Oklahoma did not respond. Correspondence is provided in the Appendix.

A meeting was also held with representatives from the USCG and the COE on April 14, 2005 to discuss navigation studies for the Red River bridge crossing. It was agreed that a preliminary design study would be conducted on the Preferred Alignment Red River bridge crossing to determine span lengths and horizontal and vertical navigation clearances and the findings presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

## **7.5 OTHER MEANS OF PUBLIC OUTREACH**

### **7.5.1 Project Mailings**

Three types of mailing lists were maintained for the study: public, local officials and agencies. The public mailing list was initiated from sign-in sheets from the June 2001 scoping public meeting. As phone calls, written comments, or Internet inquiries (see Section 7.6.5) were received, the individuals were added to the mailing list. As part of the Alignment Study phase, preliminary property information within the Preferred Corridor was collected from the Bossier, Caddo, and Desoto Parish courthouses. The property owners identified were also added to the public mailing list to reach those individuals who might not have already been aware of the project. The current public mailing list contains more than 1,600 names.

The local official's list is comprised of 53 representatives from state, regional and local government (see Table 7-5). A combination of 11 federal and state agencies participated throughout the project either through meeting attendance or through regular mailings regarding on-going project studies and project status (see Table 7-6). In addition, project information was sent to the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, and the Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma.

Direct project mailings were used to inform the addressees of upcoming meetings, project progress, planned activities and project decisions. Additional copies of announcements were also sent to local officials for posting in their communities.

### **7.5.2 Local Media Coverage**

The local media was very involved throughout the Study process. Notifications of meetings were advertised in five area newspapers (Shreveport Times, Bossier Press Tribune, Caddo Citizen, Toledo Bend Tribune, and Mansfield Enterprise). Newspapers, such as the Shreveport Times, also printed several front-page articles on the I-69 Corridor in general, this project's study process and the decisions made in the during the project's development.

Local television stations covered public meetings for local news reports. The local radio stations also interviewed the Study Team for local news broadcasts.

### **7.5.3 Project Materials Viewing Locations**

The displays and handout materials from the numerous public meetings were made available following the meetings for further public review at the Haughton Town Hall, Stonewall Town Hall, and DOTD District 04 Headquarters. Viewing times were during normal business hours.

### **7.5.4 Toll-Free Project Hotline**

A toll-free hotline (866-I69-DOTD) was established for the project so the public could contact the Study Team to comment on the project, get answers to questions or be added to the project mailing list. The hotline is available 24-hours per day, seven days per week. A voice mail system records messages during non-business hours. The toll-free hotline telephone number was announced at the June 2001 scoping meetings.

### **7.5.5 Project Website**

An Internet website ([www.i69dotd.com](http://www.i69dotd.com)) was created to inform the public of project developments, including up-to-date study information, meeting announcements, project announcements, exhibit viewing locations and times, and maps of the Study Area, and corridors and alignments being evaluated. Users could also add their names to the public mailing list, e-mail comments and questions to the Study Team,

complete the latest public comment form, or obtain the toll-free project hotline telephone number. The website was announced at the April 2002 Additional Corridor Studies public meetings and has been accessed over 17,000 times since its April 2, 2002 inception.

### **7.5.6 Public Meeting Transcripts**

Transcripts were prepared for each of the public meetings. The transcripts included the transcript of the technical presentation, names of individuals making formal statements, copies of the handout materials including comment forms, meeting sign-in sheets, and written comments received within 10 days of the meeting. The transcripts of the open forum public meetings that were advertised in local newspapers can be reviewed at all local branches of public libraries and the DOTD District 04 office.

## **7.6 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

Public Hearings will be held in Stonewall and Haughton, Louisiana approximately 10 days prior to the close of the comment period, to obtain formal comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. A final selection of a highway alignment will not be made until all comments received from the public, local officials, federal and state resource agencies, and Native American tribes have been fully evaluated.

<b>Table 7-1 PUBLIC MEETINGS</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Number of Written Comments</b>
<b>Scoping</b>			
June 6, 2001	Haughton Middle School, Haughton	100	11
June 7, 2001	North DeSoto Parish High School, Stonewall	112	24
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>212</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Corridor Studies</b>			
December 11, 2001	Haughton Middle School, Haughton	83	53
December 12, 2001	North DeSoto Parish High School, Stonewall	123	27
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>206</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Additional Corridor Studies</b>			
April 2, 2002	Haughton Middle School, Haughton	185	8
April 3, 2002	North DeSoto Parish High School, Stonewall	286	35
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>471</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Alignment Studies</b>			
July 22, 2003	North DeSoto Parish High School, Stonewall	288	*
July 23, 2003	Haughton Middle School, Haughton	381	*
	* - Comment forms did not differentiate location		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>669</b>	<b>92*</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>1,558</b>	<b>250</b>

Source: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

<b>Table 7-2 LOCAL OFFICIALS MEETINGS</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Invitees</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
May 4, 2001	DOTD District 04 Office	MPO	Scoping
June 7, 2001	DOTD District 04 Office	Local Officials' List	Scoping
December 12, 2001	DOTD District 04 Office	Local Officials' List	Corridor Studies
January 30, 2002	DOTD District 04 Office	MPO, Mayor of Shreveport, Mayor of Bossier City, Port of Shreveport-Bossier, Shreveport Chamber of Commerce	Concerns regarding proximity of corridors to the metropolitan limits and the Port of Shreveport-Bossier
April 2, 2002	DOTD District 04 Office	Local Officials' List	Additional Corridor Studies
June 5, 2002	DOTD District 04 Office	MPO, Mayor of Shreveport, Mayor of Bossier City, Port of Shreveport-Bossier, Shreveport Chamber of Commerce	Corridors developed and a preferred corridor recommendation
October 30, 2002	DOTD District 04 Office	MPO, Port of Shreveport-Bossier, Caddo Parish, Bossier Parish, Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Commission	Additional corridor revisions and the preferred corridor recommendation
July 22, 2003	DOTD District 04 Office	Local Officials' List	Alignment Studies
January 20, 2004	DOTD District 04 Office	Local Officials' List	Preferred Alignment Recommendation
July 14, 2004	Conference Call	Port of Shreveport-Bossier	Corridor Preservation MOA

Source: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

<b>Table 7-3 RESOURCE AGENCY MEETINGS</b>		
<b>Date</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Purpose / Topic</b>
June 6, 2001	Appropriate Federal and State Agencies	Scoping
December 11, 2001	Appropriate Federal and State Agencies	Corridor Studies
April 2, 2002	Appropriate Federal and State Agencies	Additional Corridor Studies
August 19, 2003	US Army Corps of Engineers	Wetlands
July 23, 2003	Appropriate Federal and State Agencies	Alignment Studies
January 25, 2005	US Fish & Wildlife Service	Threatened & Endangered Species
April 14, 2005	US Coast Guard US Army Corps of Engineers	Navigation Studies

Source: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

<b>Table 7-4 NORTHWEST LOUISIANA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE</b>	
<b>Representative</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Mayor George Dement, Chair	City of Bossier City
Randy Lucky, Vice Chair	Caddo Parish Commission
Mayor Keith Hightower	City of Shreveport
Charlie Walker	Webster Parish Police Jury
Vincent DeFatta	Bossier Metropolitan Planning Commission
Clay Peninger	Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Commission
John Holt, Jr.	Caddo-Bossier Port Commission
John Sanders (S. Bruce Easterly*)	Louisiana DOTD
Dennis Woodward	Bossier Parish Police Jury
Jamie Stetze (Virgil Page*)	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Ex-Officio
Jesse Balleza	Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Ex-Officio

Source: Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments

\*Former representative

<b>Table 7-5 LOCAL OFFICIALS</b>	
<b>Representative</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Senator David Vitter	
Senator Mary L. Landrieu	
Representative Richard H. Baker	
Representative Rodney Alexander	
Representative William J. Jefferson	
Representative Charles W. Boustany Jr.	
Representative Jim McCrery	
Representative Charlie Melancon	
Representative Bobby Jindal	
Senator Sherri Smith Cheek	District 38
Senator Robert Adley	District 36
Senator Max Tatum Malone	District 37
Senator Kenneth “Mike” Smith	District 31
Senator Lydia P. Jackson	District 39
Representative Ernest Baylor, Jr.	District 3
Representative Jean M. Doerge	District 10
Representative Cedric B. Glover	District 4
Representative Beverly Gourdon Bruce	District 7
Representative Roy “Hoppy” Hopkins	District 1
Representative Roy Burrell	District 2
Representative Billy Montgomery	District 9
Representative Joseph R. Salter	District 24
Representative Mike Powell	District 6
Representative Jane H. Smith	District 8
Representative Wayne Waddell	District 5
Mayor George Dement	City of Bossier City
Mayor Dennis Freeman	City of Logansport
Mayor Keith Hightower	City of Shreveport
Mayor Carl F. Janzen	Town of Benton

Source: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

<b>Table 7-5 (cont.) LOCAL OFFICIALS</b>	
<b>Representative</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Mayor Bill Maxey	Town of Haughton
Mayor Curtis McCune	City of Stonewall
Mayor Lynn Porter	Town of Mooringsport
Mayor Bill Robertson	Town of Minden
J. Kent Rogers	Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments (MPO)
Dennis Woodward	Bossier Parish Administrator
William C. Smith	DeSoto Parish Administrator
Bill Hanna	Caddo Parish Administrator
Shirley Byrd	Webster Parish
Lorenz Walker	City of Bossier
Eric England	Port of Shreveport-Bossier
John Holt, Jr.	Port of Shreveport-Bossier
Michael Wainwright	Port of Shreveport-Bossier
Charles Tutt	Port of Shreveport -Bossier
Roy Miller	Shreveport Airport Authority
Murry Viser	Barksdale Air Force Base
Phillip Arthur	Army National Guard – 165 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Master Battalion
John D. Caruthers	I-69 Coalition
Tommy Clark	Kansas City Southern Rail
Donald M. Pierson	Greater Bossier Economic Development
Charles Coyle	Greater Bossier Economic Development
Mike Gibson	Associated General Contractors
Mark Jusselin	Shreveport Chamber of Commerce
LTC Carl V. Thompson	LA Army National Guard

Source: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

<b>Table 7-6 AGENCIES</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Susan Jarvis	US Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg District
Michael P Jansky	US Environmental Protection Agency
Marcus N. Redford, P.E.	US Coast Guard, Eight District
Greg Solvey	FEMA Region VI
Donald Gohmert	US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service
David Soileau (Derek Hamilton*)	US Fish & Wildlife Service
Doug Booher (Peggy Thurin*)	Texas Dept of Transportation
Duke Rivet	LA Dept of Culture Recreation & Tourism
Lisa Miller	LA Dept of Environment Quality
Mike Carlos (Maurice Watson*)	LA Dept of Wildlife & Fisheries
Joseph F. DeVall	LA Dept of Natural Resources

Source: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.  
 \*Former representative