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Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) hosted the first stakeholder involvement opportunity for the Battleship TEXAS (BB-35) Dry Berth Project on Friday, May 20, 2011, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. The workshop was hosted at the DuPont Employee Recreation Association Clubhouse, located at 12029 Strang Road, La Porte, Texas.

This workshop provided key stakeholders an early opportunity to participate in the project, prior to the beginning of consultation required under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Attendance at this stakeholder workshop was by invitation-only, and attendees were provided formal letters of invitation by mail. The complete invitation database and an example of the formal letter of invitation are included in Appendix A. A reminder email was submitted to invitees for which TPWD had email addresses days before the workshop, and this email is also documented in Appendix A.

To review video documentation of the May 20, 2011 workshop, please visit: www.DryBerthTexas.com. A link to this video will be made available in July 2011.
Meeting Format and Attendee Experience

TPWD hosted this workshop-style meeting to present information about the proposed project and to provide an opportunity for stakeholder participation at the outset of this study process. The workshop was structured in three parts:

- A TPWD-led project presentation;
- An organized group brainstorming session; and
- Individual comment gathering (written and oral).

The workshop agenda is included in Appendix B.

The workshop was organized and laid out with five color-coded tables for attendees, including red, yellow, orange, blue, and green. A facility layout graphic is included in Appendix B for reference. Attendees were pre-assigned to color-coded tables according to their individual expertise and project interests. Agency representatives, elected officials, and interest groups were equally represented at each table. Seating assignments are recorded in the attendee database in Appendix C.

Upon arrival, workshop attendees were welcomed to sign in using an attendee card, which is designed to capture attendee contact information for future project use. Scanned copies of the completed attendee cards are included in Appendix C. Attendees also received a name tag and color-coded seating assignment. Twenty-four (24) attendees were recorded on May 20, 2011. Attendee information was logged in the attendee database included in Appendix C.

For reference at their tables, attendees were provided with informational project placemats, and these collateral materials are included in Appendix D. Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project representatives from TPWD, AECOM, and Crouch Environmental Services were available throughout the workshop to speak one-on-one with attendees. A staff sign-in sheet is included in Appendix C.

The workshop began promptly at 9:00 a.m., facilitated by Kay Crouch of Crouch Environmental Services. Workshop attendees and project staff briefly introduced themselves, and Ms. Crouch outlined the goals and objectives of the workshop. Neil Thomas, Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project Manager for TPWD, led a project overview PowerPoint presentation, included in Appendix D. This presentation provided project background information, illuminated key considerations, and described the project process.
Following the overview presentation, attendees were provided with individual comment forms to document comments, questions, and considerations for the project. A total of 16 individual comments were formally submitted through comment forms and email. Written comments were accepted through May 30, 2011. All comments received were recorded. The individual comment database, completed individual comment forms, and other feedback are documented in Appendix E.

Ms. Crouch then led the workshop attendees in a brainstorming session organized by table groupings (or color). Each table was provided with a “Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations” form, and attendees were charged with brainstorming to answer the following questions as a group:

- What would you do with the Battleship TEXAS?
- Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
- Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship TEXAS in her current location?
- What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
- What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Each table elected a scribe and spokesperson to document and present their group findings, ideas, and concerns. A group comment database and the completed “Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations” forms are included in Appendix E.

Before the conclusion of the workshop, attendees were given fifteen minutes to provide individual oral comments. These comments were simultaneously recorded in writing on a large presentation screen to ensure accuracy, and this documentation is included in Appendix E. The meeting adjourned promptly at 12:00 p.m.
COMMENT SUMMARY

Individual Comments

Comments were received in writing through May 30, 2011. While the meeting was attended by representatives of agencies and organized stakeholder groups, comments received are not representative of the entire agency or organization.

The individual comment database, completed individual comment forms, and other feedback are documented in Appendix E.

General Project Outlook According to Written Individual Comment Forms:

- In favor of dry berth (14)
- Neutral project outlook (2)
- Not in favor (0)

Individual comment categories reported on the individual comment forms (tally of associated comments):

- Request for preservation of the Battleship TEXAS at the existing location (12)
- Support expressed for dry berthing the Battleship TEXAS (11)
- Identification of historical relevance of the Battleship TEXAS at its current location (6)
- Concerns regarding the risk of moving the Battleship TEXAS due to its current condition (5)
- Concerns regarding alternative funding sources beyond State Legislature (4)
- Identification of tourism generated by the Battleship TEXAS at its current location (2)
- Request for further information (2)
- Identification of voter support for the Battleship TEXAS at its current location (1)
- Concerns regarding environmental impacts and required mitigation (1)
- Concerns regarding the historic cemetery site near the current location (1)
- Request for public access to the Battleship TEXAS during construction (1)
- Request to accelerate the project (1)

A majority of stakeholders attending the May 20, 2011 workshop requested that the Battleship TEXAS be dry berthed in her current location. Attendees were concerned with the risk associated with moving the Battleship TEXAS, as well as the availability of funding sources if the ship is moved from its current location. Requests for further information included alternatives to dry berthing, consideration of alternative locations, and access to technical studies when available. Alternative locations identified include Galveston, Baytown, and the Texas Coast in general.

Project considerations identified on the individual comment forms include:

- Respect for local interests
- Citizen support/public acceptability
- Current condition of the Battleship TEXAS
- Environmental impacts and required mitigation
- Available project funding
- Historical significance of the Battleship TEXAS to the area
- Tourism at current location
- Use of current location
- Preservation of the Battleship TEXAS
- Preservation of the San Jacinto Battleground
- Maintained cluster of historical assets
Individual oral comments received from attendees include:

- **Concerns** – Financing issues associated with the preservation of this ship
  - Loss of opportunity to preserve the ship with a realistic solution
- **Question** – Are there any studies that show dry berthing as an effective, long-term solution for preservation of the ship?
- **Resolution** – Desire to see this process address the issue of the final location of the battleship, desire to see the ship preserved.
- **Requirements beyond NEPA and NHPA to find a solution**
  - Put forth a good faith effort to find a final solution
  - Research outside partnership opportunities (beyond TPWD stewardship) for preservation of TEXAS
- **Financing** – State monies have been appropriated to preserve the ship in its current location; no other sources of funding have been identified to preserve the ship at this time.
- **Complexity of issues at hand** – considering two unique historic sites
- **Continue transparency throughout process**
  - Request for further information as the process moves forward (details specifically)
  - Concern that information is not being shared throughout this process
- **Clarification** – NEPA process requirements to consider alternatives as part of this project
- **Question** – Is the allotted funding still available to conduct this project? How will recent budget cuts change the scope of state operations and, in particular, this project?
- **Comment** – Transparency felt, participation in process, and gratitude for time at this meeting.

**Group Comments**

The following comments were reported in the “Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations” forms developed by table grouping during the workshop.

**General Project Outlook according to Group Comments (Tally of Associated Comments):**

- **In favor of dry berth** (3)
- **Neutral project outlook** (2)
- **Not in favor** (0)

**Group responses to questions:**

**What would you do with the Battleship TEXAS?**

- Repair and preserve the ship in the current location. (3)
- Protect and preserve the ship. (1)
- Dry berth the ship with the least environmental and historical impacts. (1)

**Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?**

- Turning Basin in Houston
- Along the Texas Coast

**Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship TEXAS in her current location?**

- Yes, the Battleship TEXAS should remain in her current location. (3)
- Consider alternative designs at this location and elsewhere. (2)
- Chosen alternative should not have negative impact on the San Jacinto Battleground or on the Battleship TEXAS. (1)
What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
• Dry berthing the ship is the feasible, most efficient, long-term alternative within the financial resources available that have already been provided. (3)
• Share designs. Very complex engineering designs require more research and knowledge about the process of dry berthing. (1)
• No comment. (1)

What other valuable feedback do you have for us?
• Moving her is not a viable option. If it had to be moved, it must be a place that is close, safe, financially feasible, and one that increased visitation.
• Moving the TEXAS from its site would devastate the clustered tourism assets at the park.
  » Overwhelming regional opinion is to keep and dry berth her at the current site.
  » Moving the ship provides substantial risk to the ship as well as the Houston Ship Channel.
• No money or organization exists to move, locate or house the TEXAS.
• While the ship is a 20th Century artifact, lying adjacent a 19th Century battlefield, they represent no conflict, but rather complement one another in depicting our history/heritage.
• The people of Texas saved and brought the battleship to the park on purpose.
• The potential risk of the TEXAS sinking during a move would be catastrophic to the state and nation’s economy - approximately $1 billion economic impact per day if the Houston Ship Channel is closed.
• The estimate to move the ship a short distance and re-create its existing slip condition is between $15-20 million, which does not include costs to repair the ship enough to be towed; that money is not available.
• What are funding alternatives if we were to move it?
• The current location w/ amenities could be the beginning of other tourist and economic activity in the area.
• Being in the “Museum without walls” region (Project Stars) it is an artifact within the “museum”.
• Procedure for moving forward with evaluation process?
• Feasibility of dry berth - potential impacts from hurricanes, etc. Long-term management of the ship within the dry-berth?
• Why AECOM evaluating all 4 options when 2 were denied by THC?
• A lot of people would be upset with moving Battleship.
• Important to avoid impact (physical and visual) to cemetery, San Jacinto Battleground.
• Keep Battleship open during project.
• Any possible plan is going to trigger an adverse effect(s) to the Battleship and battlefield.
• If relocated it must be relocated to a location with a strong tourist base/economic base.
• It appears all the alternatives are going to cost more than the $29 million set aside. Where is the additional money going to come from?
APPENDIX A

Invitation Database

Sample Letter of Invitation

Email Reminder
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles</td>
<td>Alcorn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battleship TEXAS Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kay</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>Hutchison</td>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td>Battleship TEXAS Foundation</td>
<td>284 Russell Senate Office Bldg.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Randy</td>
<td>Billingsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>President General</td>
<td>San Jacinto Descendants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scott</td>
<td>Boruff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Executive Director</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>4200 Smith School Road</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78744</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.boruff@tpwd.state.tx.us">scott.boruff@tpwd.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Janet</td>
<td>Botello</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Galveston District</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1229</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77553-1229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ron</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Sons of the Republic of Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chad</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
<td>Economic Alliance Houston Port Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. John</td>
<td>Comyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>517 Hart Senate Office Bldg.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Al</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>San Jacinto Historical Advisory Board</td>
<td>2352 Rayburn HOB</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jeffrey</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Honorable</td>
<td>State of Texas House of Representatives</td>
<td>11811 North D St.</td>
<td>La Porte</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77571-9135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jan</td>
<td>DeVault</td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>San Jacinto Battleground Association</td>
<td>1350 NASA Parkway, Suite 212</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Moni</td>
<td>DeVora-Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>17629 El Camino Real, Suite 211</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77058-3051</td>
<td><a href="mailto:moni_deVora@fw.us.gov">moni_deVora@fw.us.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alec</td>
<td>Dreyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Port of Houston Authority</td>
<td>111 East Loop North</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jeff</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td></td>
<td>c/o Munsch, Hardt Kopf and Harr.P.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1849 C Street NW (Org. 2280)</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20240</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jeffrey_Durban@nps.gov">Jeffrey_Durban@nps.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William</td>
<td>Haddock</td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>San Jacinto Descendants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim</td>
<td>Herrington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>75202-2733</td>
<td><a href="mailto:herrington.jmili@epa.gov">herrington.jmili@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob</td>
<td>Hixon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman of the Board</td>
<td>San Jacinto Museum of History Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Battleship TEXAS Foundation</td>
<td>1109 Fairmont Parkway</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Mike</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Honorable</td>
<td>State of Texas Senate</td>
<td>1200 Smith, Suite 700</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77002-4400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Linda D</td>
<td>Jamison</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daughters of the Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/25 W Alameda Parkway</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>80225</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom_bohan@jns.gov">tom_bohan@jns.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tom</td>
<td>Keohan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Greater Houston Partnership</td>
<td>4000 Smith School Road</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78744</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeffrey.kester@tpwd.state.tx.us">jeffrey.kester@tpwd.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Russel</td>
<td>Kuykendall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Complex Manager</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:russell.kuykendall@tpwd.state.tx.us">russell.kuykendall@tpwd.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Carol</td>
<td>Legard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historical Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Old Post Office Building, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., N. W, Ste. 809</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20001</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clegard@achp.gov">clegard@achp.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Ken</td>
<td>Legler</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Honorable</td>
<td>State of Texas House of Representatives</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2910</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Loretta</td>
<td>Martinez-Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Tejano Association for Historical Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jack</td>
<td>Morman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Harris County - Precinct 2</td>
<td>1001 Preston, Rm. 950</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Pete</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives</td>
<td>312 Cannon HOB</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Patrick</td>
<td>Peit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harris County Historical Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Company / Position</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Rick Perry</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>State of Texas</td>
<td>P.O. Box 12428</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave Perry</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>4200 Smith School Road</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Pickavance</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Texas Navy Association</td>
<td>1333 Isaac Hull Avenue, SE</td>
<td>Washington Navy Yard</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Christopher Pietras</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Naval Sea Systems Command</td>
<td>4700 Ave. U</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ted Poe</td>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives</td>
<td>430 Cannon HOB</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J Richard Reese, KSJ</td>
<td>President General</td>
<td>Sons of the Republic of Texas</td>
<td>909 Decker Drive, Suite 104</td>
<td>Baytown</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Justin Rhodes</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>4200 Smith School Road</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Louis Bigby</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of La Porte</td>
<td>604 W. Fairmont Parkway</td>
<td>La Porte</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Krista Schreiner Gebbia</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Preservation Texas, Inc.</td>
<td>1330 Post Oak Blvd, Ste. 2700</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Wayne Smith</td>
<td>The Honorable</td>
<td>State of Texas House of Representatives</td>
<td>5425 Polk St., Ste. H</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77023-1452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Carter Smith</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>4200 Smith School Road</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Andy Smith</td>
<td>Ship Manager</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>604 W. Fairmont Parkway</td>
<td>La Porte</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Larry Spasic</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>San Jacinto Museum of History Association</td>
<td>1330 Post Oak Blvd, Ste. 2700</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scott Stover</td>
<td>Deputy Division Director</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>4200 Smith School Road</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. George Stroke, III</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>San Jacinto Historical Advisory Board</td>
<td>3518 San Jacinto St.</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scott Triebes</td>
<td>Park Manager</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>5425 Polk St., Ste. H</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77023-1452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Erion Brimberry Tynes</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Daughters of the Republic of Texas</td>
<td>P.O. Box 12276</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Tom Keohan
NPS Intermountain Region
12795 W. Alameda Parkway
Denver, CO 80225-0287

May 12, 2011

Dear Mr. Tom Keohan:

A representative from your organization is invited to attend the first workshop for the Battleship TEXAS (BB-35) Dry Berth Project. The workshop will occur on **Friday, May 20, 2011, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.** at the DuPont Employee Recreation Association Clubhouse, located at 12029 Strang Road, La Porte, Texas. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) is hosting this workshop to present information about the proposed project and to provide an opportunity for stakeholder participation at the outset of this study process. TPWD will provide a project briefing from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., and an open discussion session will follow from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

The Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project is proposed to protect and preserve Battleship TEXAS. The dry berth facility is also proposed to enhance the overall visitor experience, including public safety, visual aesthetics, and educational opportunities. Battleship TEXAS is a 100-year-old veteran of both world wars and the only remaining dreadnought-class battleship. In 1948, Battleship TEXAS became the nation’s first permanent battleship memorial museum, and she was moored off of the Houston Ship Channel adjacent to the San Jacinto Battleground State Historic Site. The ship has remained in this wet berth for more than 60 years, vulnerable to the environmental and physical threats associated with being stationary so long in the brackish water of the channel. This wet berth also makes extensive hull repairs and significant maintenance operations difficult or impossible due to lack of access to the submerged portions of the hull. Her hull was last repaired in dry dock in the late 1980s, but only a partial hull plate replacement was possible at that time. Since then the hull has continued to become weakened by exposure, and TEXAS is overdue for another costly dry docking for major repairs. This periodic dry docking will continue to be necessary indefinitely unless another solution is found.

In 2007, Texas voters approved this $25 million dry berth project, and it was funded by the Texas State Legislature in 2009. The funding for the project also includes an additional $4 million pledge by the Battleship Texas.

To manage and conserve the natural and cultural resources of Texas and to provide hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation opportunities for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.
Mr. Tom Keohan  
May 12, 2011  
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Foundation, bringing the total project budget to $29 million. In fall of 2010, TPWD began studies to evaluate the ship’s current condition and feasibility analysis for dry berthing the ship. TPWD is now considering conceptual designs and project alternatives while preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) document in coordination with the lead federal agency, the Department of the Navy, Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA).

The EA document is being prepared to comply with the Department of the Navy requirements in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Concurrent to this action, TPWD is following the consultation process required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. To accomplish these efforts, TPWD is performing:

- engineering, archeological and environmental studies;
- alternatives analysis; and
- public involvement activities.

As part of this process, TPWD values your input through participation in the May 20 workshop. Attendance at the May 20 workshop is by invitation only. All stakeholders and other interested parties will be invited to attend a public open house that is planned for summer 2011.

To attend the May 20 workshop, please submit attendee contact information to rsvp@dryberthTEXAS.com by Monday, May 16, 2011. If you need additional information about the workshop, contact me at 512-389-4355. Those who are unable to attend the workshop but wish to submit comments may do so on or before May 30, 2011. Written comments may be mailed or emailed to:

Mr. Neil Thomas  
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department  
4200 Smith School Road  
Austin, Texas 78744  
info@dryberthTEXAS.com

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Neil Thomas  
TPWD Project Manager  
Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project
Greetings,

This email serves as a reminder for the first workshop for the Battleship TEXAS (BB-35) Dry Berth Project. You or a representative from your organization previously received a formal letter of invitation, and we would like to encourage your attendance on Friday, May 20, 2011.

The workshop will occur on Friday, May 20, 2011, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the DuPont Employee Recreation Association Clubhouse, located at 12029 Strang Road, La Porte, Texas. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) is hosting this workshop to present information about the proposed project and to provide an opportunity for stakeholder participation at the outset of this study process. TPWD will provide a project briefing from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., and an open discussion session will follow from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Directions to the DuPont Employee Recreation Association Clubhouse are attached for your convenience.

Attendance at the May 20 workshop is by invitation only. All stakeholders and other interested parties will be invited to attend a public open house that is planned for summer 2011. To attend the May 20 workshop, please submit attendee contact information to rsvp@dryberthTEXAS.com. If you need additional information about the workshop, contact the TPWD Project Manager, Mr. Neil Thomas, at 512-389-4355.

Those who are unable to attend the workshop but wish to submit comments may do so on or before May 30, 2011. Written comments may be mailed or emailed to:

Mr. Neil Thomas
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, Texas 78744
info@dryberthTEXAS.com
Respectfully,

The Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project Team

--

Leslie Hollaway Pompa
Director of Communications
Crouch Environmental Services, Inc.
P. 713-868-1043
F. 713-863-7944
www.crouchenvironmental.com
May 20 Workshop for the Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project

Directions to the DuPont Employee Recreation Association Clubhouse, 12029 Strang Rd, La Porte, 77571:

Approaching from **Houston** (on I-45 South)

1. Follow I-45 South (Gulf Freeway) to Interstate 610 East
2. Take exit 40B to merge onto I-610 East toward TX-225/Pasadena Freeway (approx. 1.9 mi)
3. Take exit 30B for TX-225 E toward Pasadena/La Porte (approx. 0.5 mi)
4. Merge onto TX-225 East (approx. 12.4 mi)
5. Take exit toward Sens Rd/Strang Rd (approx 0.4 mi)
6. Merge onto Pasadena Freeway Frontage Road (approx. 0.4 mi)
7. Turn left onto Sens Rd (approx. 0.8 mi)
8. Take first right onto Strang Rd (approx. 0.1 mi)
9. 12029 Strang Rd will be on the left

Approaching from **Baytown** (on TX-146 South)

1. Follow TX-146 South to TX-225 West exit
2. Exit onto TX-225 W toward Pasadena/Houston (approx. 0.7 mi)
3. Take exit toward Sens Rd/Strang Rd (approx 0.3 mi)
4. Merge onto Pasadena Freeway Frontage Road (approx. 400 ft)
5. Take exit towards Sens Rd (approx 0.3 mi)
6. Turn right onto Sens Rd (approx 0.6 mi)
7. Take first right onto Strang Rd (approx. 0.1 mi)
8. 12029 Strang Rd will be on the left

Approaching from **Galveston** (on TX-146 North)

1. Take I-45 North via TX-87/Broadway/Avenue J
2. Take exit 7A for Texas City towards TX-3/TX-146/La Marque (approx. 9.2 mi)
3. Merge onto “Texas City Wye” following TX-146 North (approx. 0.8 mi)
4. Take the exit onto TX-225 West toward Pasadena/Houston (approx 25.2 mi)
5. Take exit toward Sens Rd/Strang Rd (approx. 0.9 mi)
6. Merge onto Pasadena Freeway Frontage Road (approx. 0.4 mi)
7. Turn left onto Sens Rd (approx. 0.8 mi)
8. Take first right onto Strang Rd (approx. 0.1 mi)
9. 12029 Strang Rd will be on the left

Approaching from **Houston** (on I-10 East)

1. Follow I-10 East to Interstate 610 South
2. Take exit 775A for 1-610 S (keep right at fork)
3. Take exit 30B for TX-225 E toward Pasadena/La Porte (approx. 4.3 mi)
4. Merge onto TX-225 East (approx. 13.0 mi)
5. Take exit toward Sens Rd/Strang Rd (approx 0.4 mi)
6. Merge onto Pasadena Freeway Frontage Road (approx. 0.4 mi)
7. Turn left onto Sens Rd (approx. 0.8 mi)
8. Take first right onto Strang Rd (approx. 0.1 mi)
9. 12029 Strang Rd will be on the left
APPENDIX B

Workshop Agenda
Workshop Layout
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:10</td>
<td>Attendee registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 – 9:25</td>
<td>Introductions and brief explanation of meeting structure and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay Crouch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:25 – 9:50</td>
<td>Overview of the project status and today’s meeting purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50 – 10:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15</td>
<td>Individual Comment Period (using Individual Comment Forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:00</td>
<td>Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:10</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 – 11:40</td>
<td>Presentation of team ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay Crouch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40 – 12:00</td>
<td>Workshop wrap-up and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Break for the day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Workshop Layout for May 20, 2011
APPENDIX C

Attendee Database with Seating Assignments
Attendee Cards
Staff Sign-in Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Table Color</th>
<th>Public Official</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Information Preference</th>
<th>Request to be a Section 106 Consulting Party</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Additions to Project Mailing List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Historical Commission</td>
<td>P.O. Box 12276</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78711</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.denton@thc.state.tx.us">mark.denton@thc.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>THC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Historical Commission</td>
<td>P.O. Box 12276</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78711</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kelly.little@thc.state.tx.us">kelly.little@thc.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>Mail / Email</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanienn</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Historical Commission</td>
<td>P.O. Box 12276</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78711</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adrienne.campbell@thc.state.tx.us">adrienne.campbell@thc.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>Mail / Email</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>THC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Battleship Texas Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Androy</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>2000 Fort Point Road</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77550</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jerry.l.androy@usace.army.mil">jerry.l.androy@usace.army.mil</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeologist</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>2000 Fort Point Road</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77550</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philip.s.evans@usace.army.mil">philip.s.evans@usace.army.mil</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>Mike Jackson</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77504</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barbara.lewis@senate.state.tx.us">barbara.lewis@senate.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>2000 Fort Point Road</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77550</td>
<td><a href="mailto:katherine.m.taylor@usace.army.mil">katherine.m.taylor@usace.army.mil</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry</td>
<td>McMahan</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Port of Houston Authority</td>
<td>111 East Loop North</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77029</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmmcmahan@poha.com">gmmcmahan@poha.com</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Port of Houston Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Spasic</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>Chapter SRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Representative Ana Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>Descendants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Piper</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>NAA National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
<td>4700 Ave U</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77551</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erin.piper@Naa.gov">erin.piper@Naa.gov</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>Mike Gallages</td>
<td>P.O. Box 41</td>
<td>Galena</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77547</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ana.clark@senate.state.tx.us">ana.clark@senate.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>Mail / Email</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>State Representative Ana Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>Rivera</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Liaison</td>
<td>Congressman Gene Green</td>
<td>256 N. Sam Houston Pkwy E, Suite 29</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77060</td>
<td><a href="mailto:riveral@mail.house.gov">riveral@mail.house.gov</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Boaze</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>604 W. Fairmont Pkwy</td>
<td>La Porte</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77571</td>
<td><a href="mailto:boazema@laporetx.gov">boazema@laporetx.gov</a></td>
<td>Mail / Email</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ron Bottoms, City Manager: <a href="mailto:bottomsr@laporetx.gov">bottomsr@laporetx.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Sons of the Republic of Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Alliance</td>
<td>Houston Port Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donny</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harris County Parks Manager</td>
<td>Harris County</td>
<td>5001 NASA Road 1</td>
<td>Seabrook</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77586</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donnytaylor@pcl2.hctx.net">donnytaylor@pcl2.hctx.net</a></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battleship Texas Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Battleship Texas Foundation</td>
<td>Tony K. Gregory; Chairman, Battleship Texas Foundation (Same Address)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Devault</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Jacinto Battleground Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual and San Jacinto Battleground Association</td>
<td>Cecil Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammie</td>
<td>Nielsen</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Representative</td>
<td>Ken Legler</td>
<td>1109 Fairmont Parkway</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77504</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tammie.nielsen@house.state.tx.us">tammie.nielsen@house.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>Email / Video</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Pasadena Business Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Representatives of the Texas Historical Commission (THC) participated in the discussions and provided general comments, but refrained from expressing any opinions regarding project alternatives.*
Attendee Card

Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project Workshop
DERA Clubhouse, 12029 Strang Rd, La Porte, Texas

Friday, May 20, 2011

Attendee Cards

1.

Are you a public official or public official representative? (Please Check One) Yes X No ___ Position ___

First Name Mark Last Name Densten

Organization that you are representing, if any: Texas Historical Commission

Mailing Address P O Box 12374

City, State, Zip Code Austin, TX 78711

Email Address mark.densten@the.state.tx.us

How would you prefer to receive your information? (Please check one) Website ___ Mail ___ From a Friend ___ Email X Video/DVD Presentation ___ Other ___

Please provide contact information for any individuals or organizations who should be added to the project mailing list.

Would you like to participate in this project as a consulting party for the Section 106 consultation process? Yes X No ___

If yes, would you be participating: As an individual ___ Representing an agency/organization ___ Agency/organization name ___

2.

Are you a public official or public official representative? (Please Check One) Yes X No ___ Position ___

First Name Kelly Last Name Little

Organization that you are representing, if any: Texas Historical Commission

Mailing Address P O Box 12374

City, State, Zip Code Austin, TX 78711

Email Address kelly.little@the.state.tx.us

How would you prefer to receive your information? (Please check one) Website ___ Mail ___ From a Friend ___ Email X Video/DVD Presentation ___ Other ___

Please provide contact information for any individuals or organizations who should be added to the project mailing list.

Would you like to participate in this project as a consulting party for the Section 106 consultation process? Yes X No ___

If yes, would you be participating: As an individual ___ Representing an agency/organization ___ Agency/organization name ___
Attendee Card
Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project Workshop
DERA Clubhouse, 12029 Strang Rd, La Porte, Texas
Friday, May 20, 2011

Are you a public official or public official representative? (Please check one) Yes X No Position

First Name: Jose Last Name: Rivera
Organization that you are representing, if any: City, State, Zip Code: Houston, TX 77060
Mailing Address: 2560 N Sam Houston Pkwy E, Ste 29 Phone: Cell: Email Address: jrivera@mail.house.gov

How would you prefer to receive your information? (Please check one) Website X Mail _ From a Friend _ Email Video/DVD Presentation _ Other 

Please provide contact information for any individuals or organizations who should be added to the project mailing list:

Would you like to participate in this project as a consulting party for the Section 106 consultation process? Yes _ No _
If yes, would you be participating:
As an Individual _ Representing an agency/organization _ Agency/organization name:

Attendee Card
Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project Workshop
DERA Clubhouse, 12029 Strang Rd, La Porte, Texas
Friday, May 20, 2011

Are you a public official or public official representative? (Please check one) Yes X No Position City Manager, Official

First Name: Melissa Last Name: Beaze
Organization that you are representing, if any: City of La Porte
Mailing Address: 100 W Fairmont Pkwy
City, State, Zip Code: La Porte, TX 77571
Email Address: beaze@laportetx.gov

How would you prefer to receive your information? (Please check one) Website X Mail _ From a Friend _ Email Video/DVD Presentation _ Other 

Please provide contact information for any individuals or organizations who should be added to the project mailing list:

Ron Bottoms, City Manager bottomsra@laportetx.gov

Would you like to participate in this project as a consulting party for the Section 106 consultation process? Yes _ No 
If yes, would you be participating:
As an Individual _ Representing an agency/organization _ Agency/organization name:
PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT
Are you a public official or public official representative? (Please Check One) Yes_ No_ Position _

Organization that you are representing, if any — BATTLESHP TEXAS FOUNDATION

How would you prefer to receive your information? (Please check one) — Please let me know preferences. Other _

Website _ Mail _ From a Friend _ Email _ Video/DVD Presentation _ Other _

Please provide contact information for any individuals or organizations who should be added to the project mailing list.

PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT

Would you like to participate in this project as a consulting party for the Section 106 consultation process? Yes_ No_ If yes, would you be participating: As an individual_ Representing an agency/organization_ Agency/organization name _

PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT

PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT

PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT
Attendee Card
Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project Workshop
DERA Clubhouse, 12029 Strang Rd, La Porte, Texas...Friday, May 20, 2011

Are you a public official or public official representative? (Please Check One) Yes__ No__ Position____

First Name_ Janet K. ___ Last Name_ Longer

Organization that you are representing, if any______________________
Mailing Address__________________
City, State, Zip Code________________
Email Address_____________________

How would you prefer to receive your information? (Please check one)
Website _ Mail _ From a Friend _ Email _ Video/DVD Presentation _ Other__

Please provide contact information for any individuals or organizations who should be added to the project mailing list.

Would you like to participate in this project as a consulting party for the Section 106 consultation process? Yes__ No__
If yes, would you be participating:
As an individual___ Representing an agency/organization___ Agency/organization name____________________

PRIVACY CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT
# Staff Sign-in Sheet

## Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project
May 20, 2011 Workshop
Staff Sign In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME (PLEASE PRINT)</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/COMPANY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Patty Matthews</td>
<td>5751 Woodway St., Houston</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Laura Bush</td>
<td>4200 Smith St., Austin, TX 78724</td>
<td>TPWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Jeff Kester</td>
<td>4200 Smith St., Austin</td>
<td>TPWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Andy Smith</td>
<td>3503 Independence Ave., San Antonio, TX 78232</td>
<td>TPWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Scott Trebby</td>
<td>803 Independence Ave., San Antonio, TX 78232</td>
<td>TPWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Russ Kuechenbier</td>
<td></td>
<td>TPWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Travis Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>TPWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ruth Matthews</td>
<td>14200 White Oak Rd., Houston, TX 77086</td>
<td>TPWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Andrew Sipes</td>
<td></td>
<td>TPWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kay Crouch</td>
<td>402 Tatsworth, Houston, TX 77025</td>
<td>CESSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Greg Crouch</td>
<td></td>
<td>CESSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Leslie Haman</td>
<td></td>
<td>CESSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Max Truantino</td>
<td></td>
<td>CESSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Greg Sevick</td>
<td></td>
<td>CESSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Informational Placemats

Project Overview PowerPoint Presentation
Texans will protect and preserve the Battleship TEXAS.

Battleship TEXAS – A Ship of Firsts
- First airplane flight off of a U.S. Navy battleship (1919)
- First talking movie aboard a U.S. Navy ship (1930)
- Birthplace of the 1st Marine Division of the U.S. Marine Corps (1941)
- First memorial battleship gifted to a state (1948)
- First permanent battleship memorial museum in the U.S. (1948)
- First battleship to be declared a U.S. National Historic Landmark (1977)

TEXAS is a mobile battlefield, as hallowed as the Alamo and Iwo Jima...
The Battleship Texas protected our nation for three decades, through two World Wars; it is time she gets the same protection in her permanent dry-berth home.
The purpose of the proposed action is to provide a dry berth for the Battleship TEXAS (BB-35). Since 1948, the Battleship TEXAS has been secured adjacent to the San Jacinto Battleground State Historic Site in a slip off the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channel in Harris County, Texas. Annually, approximately 100,000 visitors tour, study, and experience the Battleship TEXAS at this location.

Today, the Battleship TEXAS is subject to dire environmental and physical threats. It is disintegrating and sinking due to the hull’s long exposure to brackish water. This National Historic Landmark is in imminent threat of deterioration, and there is an immediate and urgent need to prevent the loss of historical integrity.

Our Goals...

The project is being proposed to meet the following needs:

- Protect and preserve the Battleship and its rare historical archives and artifacts
- Maintain the Battleship’s historical landmark status
- Preserve the Battleship’s cultural landscape quality
- Guarantee public access, preserve educational opportunities and enhance the overall visitor experience
- Enhance the visual aesthetics of the ship and its surroundings
- Improve public access safety
- Reduce long-term maintenance costs for the ship and its berth
- Maintain ability to refloat the ship for reversibility
- Assure regulatory compliance

“Battleship TEXAS Almost Sinks Again”
-Houston Press, June 15, 2010

“Battleship TEXAS celebrates 100 years — and fights for survival”
-11 News Houston, June 24, 2010
An Expert Approach

Initial Study and Development
1. Initial study (including evaluation of battleship condition and development of design criteria for a dry berth)
2. Determination of scope of analysis (including environmental and cultural/historical considerations)

Review and Refinement
3. Initial stakeholder outreach (Stakeholder workshops are held inviting ideas, comments and feedback)
4. Development of proposed action and alternatives
   - Completion of environmental, cultural/historical, and engineering studies

Finalization
5. Further development and screening of alternatives
6. Public review and comment (A public open house is held inviting feedback on the project alternatives and constraints)
7. Alternatives refinement (Stakeholder input and additional technical data are incorporated to further refine alternatives)
8. Selection of preferred alternative(s) and preparation of Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) document

Implementation
9. Public review and comment (The Draft EA and preferred alternative(s) are made available for public review and comment. A public hearing is held inviting comments)
10. Finalization of the preferred alternative(s) (The EA document and preferred alternative(s) are finalized per resource agency and public comments)
11. Agency decision (A final decision regarding the EA document is made by the project’s lead agency, Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA))
12. Implementation of the final concept

Careful Considerations
- Environmental Factors
- Cultural Resources
- Public Participation
What? Where? When?

A shared vision is required…
National Historic Landmarks
- San Jacinto Battleground
- Battleship TEXAS

National Engineering Landmarks
- San Jacinto Monument
- Battleship TEXAS

Cultural Resources

Battle of San Jacinto - 1836
TEXAS Arrives at San Jacinto - 1948

Three Distinct Environments on 1200 Acres
- Coastal Prairie
- Bottomland Forest
- Tidal Marsh

Natural Resources
Marsh Restoration
- Successful to date
- Incomplete
- More Fill Needed (estimated 200,000 - 300,000 CY)

Prairie Restoration
- More dependent on capital project execution
- Slower progress

*Limits Approximate

Prairie and Marsh Restoration

Orientation to Current Site

Battleship TEXAS (1948)
San Jacinto Monument (1936-1939)
San Jacinto Battleground (1836)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth</td>
<td>$25M Bond Money / $4M Donation from BTF</td>
<td>Commenced prelim design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto Visitor’s Center</td>
<td>$4.2M in FHWA reimbursement</td>
<td>DRAFT EA / Pending 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkhead Replacement</td>
<td>$2.6M in pending BOEMRE grant (more needed)</td>
<td>Pending Final Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Trail Hub and TEXAS Wharf</td>
<td>$16.1M in pending FHWA reimbursement</td>
<td>Pending FHWA Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie and Marsh Restoration</td>
<td>State funds, grants, donations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Capital Projects</td>
<td>State funds</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Ongoing Projects…

Managing the Vision – Master Plan!
Implementing the Master Plan – Schematic Design

Project Framework

Why are we here today?
2007
Texas voters approved a $25M bond issue for the Battleship TEXAS project. The 80th Legislature authorized use of these bond funds for preserving the ship pending approval by the Texas Legislative Budget Board (LBB).

Proposition 4

2008
An engineering assessment was submitted to the LBB that explored ways to preserve the Battleship TEXAS in an economically viable way.

Based in part on this study, TPWD proposes to place her in a permanent dry berth.

“Proceanic Report”
2009
LBB legally mandated that the use of the bond funds for the preservation of TEXAS is contingent upon dry berthing the ship in its current location.

Location + Dry Berth = $25M

Project Criteria
Due to several triggering factors, the dry berth project must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Sections 106 and 110(f) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Federal statutory requirements
Project Criteria

NEPA requires, among other criteria, the consideration of “all reasonable alternatives” that serve the specific project purpose and need.

The lead federal agency for this project is the Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA).

“No Action” is an alternative

Project Criteria

It is TPWD’s opinion that it is reasonable to only consider dry berth alternatives that allow TPWD to retain stewardship of TEXAS.

No TPWD Stewardship = No TPWD Project
TPWD’s proposed project is to create a dry berth solution that will also meet the following 3 criteria:

• The solution must be reversible;

• The solution must respect the battleground site;

• The solution must provide a less expensive long-term alternative to conducting major dry docking every 10-15 years.
APPENDIX E

Individual Comment Database
Individual Comment Forms
Group Comment Database
Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations Forms
Individual Oral Comment Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Elected Official</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Spasic</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Jacinto Museum of History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Piper</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)</td>
<td>4700 Avenue U</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77551</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erin.piper@noaa.gov">erin.piper@noaa.gov</a></td>
<td>409.766.3699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana L.</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Legislative Assistant for Senator Mario Galligos</td>
<td>Office of State Senator Mario Galligos</td>
<td>PO Box 41</td>
<td>Galena Park</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77547</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ana.clark@senate.state.tx.us">ana.clark@senate.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>713.678.8600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment/Request Summary**

1. Preserve the Battleship TEXAS on a permanent basis right where it is.
2. I would not consider moving it, there are no other alternate sites because of her condition, realities of finance and the history of the will of Texas citizens, its political hazards. We need to respect all Texas history.
3. Yes, too important to risk at other sites.
4. It is feasible, most efficient idea and with financial resources that are already available.
5. The people of Texas saved the Battleship TEXAS and brought it to the San Jacinto Battlefield. Citizens, students, political leaders, historical organizations supported its location at the battlefield. (Status) The SJM of H mission is to preserve and interpret the battlefield in all its historic elements.
6. Considering the ship’s condition - it can not be practically moved. Money provided by the Texas Legislature are for its current location!!

**Project Considerations**

1. Respect the History of the will of the people of Texas
2. DO NOT risk the Battleship
3. Respect the will of local interest

NMFS would need to know information regarding all existing habitat at the site, how this habitat would be impacted and what type of mitigation would be proposed prior to making a recommendation regarding what should be done with the ship. We would support the least environmental damaging option but would also be considerate of other needs regarding the ship.

She could be moved to an existing deepwater area that would require no additional dredging or further environmental impact.

If it is the least environmentally damaging option, yes but again, would be considerate of other project needs.

Would provide permanent solution to maintaining condition of the ship. Mitigation options are close to the site which is ideal if impacts to open water habitat are required.

1. Environmental impacts (shallow/open water habitat, etc.)
2. Proposed mitigation for environmental impacts

Try to keep it as close to the general area where it sits now. The Battleship TEXAS has been a historical landmark in the Houston area for a long time. It would be unfortunate to move it to another city.

- Maybe moved to Galveston/Baytown areas?
- I would be in favor of leaving it where it is now also.
- Dry berthing is fine if it will minimize the progressive damage, environmental or otherwise, to the ship.
- Funding is also important in making a decision.

1. Financial - Cost
2. Environmental or any other physical damage to the ship
3. Historical significance of TEXAS to area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Elected Official</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Comment/Request Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Marie      | Taylor    | N               | Federal agency representative | USACE, Regulatory Branch | 2000 Fort Point Road | Galveston | TX | 77550 | katherine.m.taylor@usace.army.mil | 409.766.3926 | • Proceed with consideration of dry berthing in the current location. While alternative sites are important to consider, it appears that there is considerable risk to the ship in moving it elsewhere.  
• Dry berthing seems to be a more economical, long-term solution to maintaining the ship’s integrity than dry-dock repairs every 10-15 years.  
• From an ecological, natural resources perspective, I think alternative sites along Texas inshore should be explored - if there are sites with vastly smaller (fewer) impacts, the risk of moving the ship may be worth it.  
• Besides dry-docking and dry-berthing, are there any other alternatives for preserving the TEXAS???  
• More information about the possible technical design options is needed to make informed decisions. |
| Melissa    | Boaze     | Y               | City Manager’s Office Manager | City of La Porte | 604 West Fairmont Parkway | La Porte | TX | 77550 | boazema@laportetx.gov | 281.470.5016 | • Dry berth if it is the only possibility to preserve it.  
• I am very much in favor of leaving her in her current location.  
• It's already where it needs to be...home! |
| Garry      | McMahan   | N               | Port of Houston Authority | 111 East Loop North | Houston | TX | 77550 | gmcmahan@poha.com | 713.670.2594 | If funds were unlimited I would prefer to continue the current process of dry docking it periodically in order to keep it afloat. However, since funds are not unlimited, dry berthing the ship is an acceptable alternative. Preferably in the current location, if it had to be moved it should be moved to a location where tourists currently frequent, i.e.: Galveston. |
| Steven K.  | Howell    | N               | Battleship TEXAS Foundation | | | | | | | | 1. Dry berth the TEXAS at the San Jacinto State Historic Site.  
2. Don’t move her.  
3. Absolutely.  
4. It is a project that is long overdue.  
5. This project should be expedited to the greatest extent possible. |
| Barbara    | Lewis     | Y               | Constituent Services Direction | Senator Mike Jackson | 1109 Fairmont Parkway | Pasadena | TX | 77504 | barbra.lewis@senate.state.tx.us | 713.948.0111 | In favor leaving battleship at present location.  
I am in favor of dry berth, I'm in a meeting several years ago when this solution was discussed. Citizens will come to visit. Good PR program needed. Younger citizens are unaware the battleship is located here or even know about the battlegrounds or the monument. |
| Chad       | Burke     | N               | San Jacinto Texas Historic District and Economic Alliance | | | | | | | | 1. We should dry berth the TEXAS right where she is: per the will of the Texas voters.  
2. I would not consider moving her. There is no legitimate reason to move the TEXAS, nor is there money, resources or a location to move her to. Furthermore, moving the TEXAS from this site would devastate the clustered tourism assets at the park.  
• I fully support dry berthing the TEXAS in order to permanently preserve her for future generations of Texans.  
• Those individuals promoting relocating the TEXAS do not have the best interest of the ship in mind, but rather a goal of removing her from the battleground.  
1. Dry berthing in current location  
2. Completing the project in budget |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Elected Official?</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Comment/Request Summary</th>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donald H.</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battleship TEXAS Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ship must be repaired and preserved via a dry berth. Her historical/cultural importance is too great to contemplate otherwise. The only consideration I would give to re-locating her would be to increase visitorship. However, I know of no other location available - and reachable - in which she will be as protected. Other locations leave her more exposed to weather/environment. She should remain at San Jacinto. Dry berthing is the only real solution to preservation. Exposure to brackish water is progressively destroying her. The ship has become part and parcel of San Jacinto over the decades. A berth exists here; no new funding need be found to obtain another. I find no conflict in a 20th century ship lying adjacent a 19th century battlefield. History is a continuum, and as long as we place and arrange appropriately, the history, and heritage can be displayed in perfect harmony. 1. Dry berth to ensure preservation 2. Site selection - Current location is highest/best use costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammie</td>
<td>Nielsen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>District Director</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>1109 Fairmont Parkway</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77505</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tammie.nielsen@house.state.tx.us">tammie.nielsen@house.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>713.944.1092</td>
<td>1. I believe the Battleship TEXAS should remain where it is with area improvements made to increase the desirability of tourism. 2. I believe dry berthing the ship is the best hope of maintaining the integrity of the ship long term for generations not yet here. 3. The only way I would consider moving the ship is if that is the only way to save it. 1. Funding if moved 2. Preservation of the TEXAS 2. Preservation of the Battlefield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SRT</td>
<td></td>
<td>113 Bayridge Road</td>
<td>Morgan's Point</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77571</td>
<td><a href="mailto:surfdory@mac.com">surfdory@mac.com</a></td>
<td>281.471.2283</td>
<td>1. Agree with dry berth 2. Emphasis on protecting cemetery and restoring cemetery 3. I want to keep battleship open during construction of dry berth 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milo</td>
<td>Strickland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Mayor, Morgan's Point</td>
<td></td>
<td>113 Bayridge Road</td>
<td>Morgan's Point</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77571</td>
<td><a href="mailto:surfdory@mac.com">surfdory@mac.com</a></td>
<td>281.471.2283</td>
<td>• I believe that the TPWD Master Plan Should proceed, that the spirit of the will of the voters be recognized and that the TEXAS be dry berthed in her current location. Any move would be both risky and costly and would only benefit a self serving minority. • I had the pleasure of a “hard hat tour” of the TEXAS, along with a German engineer friend and his teenage son. It was an incredible experience. The point here is that, as the last dreadnought, the TEXAS gets international attention. • I remember my mother speaking of a fund raising drive for the TEXAS, many years ago, where school children contributed small change - so that the TEXAS could stay in its present location, as a Memorial to those Americans who served their country in two wars. 1. Total cost &lt;see item #1&gt; etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Individual Comment Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Elected Official</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Comment/Request Summary</th>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>City of Shoreacres</td>
<td>3419A Bayou Forest</td>
<td>Shoreacres</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77571</td>
<td><a href="mailto:porsche77058@yahoo.com">porsche77058@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>281.471.8888</td>
<td>1. I would like to see her dry berthed at its present location. Fill in the slip from the channel with dirt, add a surface of some type and display the ship out of the salt water. 2. I would not move her. I know some consider it sacred ground for the battle and deaths of soldiers, but the current location is easy to access and familiar to most. 3. Yes to dry berthing. The salt water will ruin her. 4. I am a contributing member of the battleship TEXAS Foundation, we MUST save this beautiful dreadnought!</td>
<td>1. Fund raising of all sorts to continue the project. 2. Dry berth and continue restoration. 3. Keep her in current location, it has been there for many years, keep bringing tourism to La Porte and Deer Park, not Houston. 4. DO NOT TOW HER! 5. Advertise the Battleship TEXAS Foundation more. 6. Promote her history and presence. 7. Earmark a Battleship TEXAS Day, big party, etc. Sorry, I only came up with 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Borowski</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Director, San Jacinto Historic District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Battleship TEXAS should be dry berthed and remain in its current location. It is a key attraction to the San Jacinto Monument area. The Battleship TEXAS represents the same sense of freedom and protecting the country as does the San Jacinto Monument itself. They mirror the same ideals carried through time by generations of Texans. Moving the Battleship TEXAS would diminish the synergy of both “Monuments to Freedom.” 1. Maintain clustered historical assets to increase attracting visitors from distant areas. 2. Maintain clustered historical assets for greater site impact. 3. Preserve Texas history from all eras. 4. Make available to the public. 5. Serve public good economically.</td>
<td>1. Maintain clustered historical assets to increase attracting visitors from distant areas. 2. Maintain clustered historical assets for greater site impact. 3. Preserve Texas history from all eras. 4. Make available to the public. 5. Serve public good economically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>DeVault</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>San Jacinto Battleground Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dear Neil, Attached is my blue attendance card. I have also copied Leslie from Crouch Environmental who I believe was collecting cards. I took my card from the meeting because I wanted to add the address of Cecil Jones and all of his contact information. He should be added to the project mailing list. In addition, you should contact: Krista Giebbia % Preservation Texas to see if her group wants to participate as a consulting party. I know Krista is busy in Austin, at present, since this session of the legislature is winding down and critical budget issues remain. I was very, very disappointed in the format of the meeting, the printed materials, and the fact that the process of “stakeholder outreach” began without a NAVSEA representative or a member of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in attendance. Best, Jan</td>
<td>1. Maintain clustered historical assets to increase attracting visitors from distant areas. 2. Maintain clustered historical assets for greater site impact. 3. Preserve Texas history from all eras. 4. Make available to the public. 5. Serve public good economically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION**

**REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT**
Battleship TEXAS Dry Berth Project — May 20, 2011 Stakeholder Workshop Summary Report

Individual Comment Forms

PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT

---

1. Preserve the Battleship Texas as preserved, right where it is.
2. I would not consider moving it. There are no other alternative sites because of her condition, reality of finances and the history of the will of Texas citizens and its 340,000 pounds (440,000 pounds need to remove all today's history.)
3. Yes, I'm interested in other sites.
4. It is feasible, efficient with financing resources that are required already.
5. The people of Texas saved the Battleship Texas and brought it to the San Jacinto Battleground. Citizens, students, political leaders, historical organizations supported its location at the Battleground.

The goal of the project is to preserve and interpret the Battleship in all its historic elements. Considering the ship's condition, it may not be practically preserved.

List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

**Project Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve the history of the people of Texas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect the wish of local residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not risk the Battleship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Are you a public official or public official representative? ☑ Yes ☐ No Position.

Name and Mailing Address (Optional):
Name: Erin Piper
Affiliation: NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Address: 4700 Ave U, Galveston, TX 77551
Email Address: Erin_piper@noaa.gov
Telephone: 409-766-3199

What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:
NMFS would need to know information regarding all existing existing habitat at the site, how this habitat would be impacted and what type of mitigation would be proposed prior to making a recommendation regarding what should be done with the ship. We would support the least environmental damaging option but would also be considerate of other needs regarding the ship.

She could be moved to an existing deepwater area that would require no dredging or further environmental impact.

If it is the least environmentally damaging option, yes but again, would be considerate of other project needs.
would provide permanent solution to maintaining condition of the ship. Mitigation options are close to the site which is ideal if impacts to open water habitat are required.

List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10, (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts (shallow/open water habitat, etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed mitigation for environmental impacts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Name: Ana L. Clark
Affiliation: Office of State Senator Mario Gallegos
Address: P.O. Box 41 Galena Park, TX 77547
Email Address: ana.clark@senate.state.tx.us
Telephone: 713-678-8100

What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:
- Dry to keep it as close to the area where it sits now. Since Battleship Texas has been a historical landmark in the Houston area for a long time, it would be unfortunate to move it to another city.
- May be moved to Galveston/Kemah area.
- I would be in favor of leaving it where it is and also.
- Dry berthing is fine if it will minimize the progressive damage environment or otherwise to the ship.
- Funding is also important in making a decision.
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial - Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental or any other physical damage to ship</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical significance of TEXAS to area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Name: Marie Taylor
Affiliation: USACE, Regulatory Branch
Address: 8000 Fort Point Road, Galveston, TX 77550
Email Address: Katherine.m.taylor@usace.army.mil
Telephone: 409-764-3924

* What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
* Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
* Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
* What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
* What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:

* Proceed with consideration of dry berthing in the current location. While alternative sites are important to consider, it appears that there is considerable risk to the ship in moving it elsewhere.

* Dry berthing seems to be a more economical, long-term solution to maintaining the ship’s integrity than dry dock repairs every 10-15 years.

* From an ecological, natural resources perspective, I think alternatives sites along TX coast should be explored - if there are sites with vastly smaller (even) impacts the risk of moving the ship may be worth it.
Besides dry-docking and dry-berthing, are there any other alternatives for preserving the TEXAS? 

More information about the deck the possible technical design options is needed to make informed decisions.

List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

**Texas Parks and Wildlife Department**
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Name: Melissa Beaze
Affiliation: City of LaPorte
Address: 604 W. Fairmont Pkwy.
Email Address: beaze.ml@laporte.tx.gov
Telephone: 281-470-5011

- What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
- Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
- Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
- What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
- What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:

Dry berth if it is the only possibility to preserve it.
I am very much in favor of leaving her in her current location.
It's already where it needs to be... Home!
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

**Texas Parks and Wildlife Department**  
ATTN: Neil Thomas  
4200 Smith School Road  
Austin, TX 78744  
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Are you a public official or public official representative? ☐ Yes ☑ No Position

Name and Mailing Address (Optional):
Name:  Garry McMahon
Affiliation: Port of Houston Authority
Address:  111 East Loop North
Email Address:  gmcmahean@poha.com
Telephone:  713-670-2594

* What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
* Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
* Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
* What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
* What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:

If funds were unlimited I would prefer to continue the current process of dry docking it periodically in order to keep it afloat. However, since funds are not unlimited dry docking the ship is an acceptable alternative. Preferably in the current location. If it had to be moved it should be moved to a location where tourists currently frequent, i.e.: Galveston.
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical significance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department  
ATTN: Neil Thomas  
4200 Smith School Road  
Austin, TX 78744  
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT

1. DRY BERTH THE TEXAS AT THE JAN JACINTO STATE HISTORIC SITE.
2. DON’T MOVE HER.
3. ABSOLUTELY.
4. IT IS A PROJECT THAT IS LONG OVERDUE.
5. THIS PROJECT SHOULD BE EXPEDITED TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE.
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

**Project Considerations**

**Build the dry berth @ San Jacinto ASAP!**

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department  
ATTN: Neil Thomas  
4200 Smith School Road  
Austin, TX 78744  
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
BATTLESHIP TEXAS
Dry Berth Project

May 20, 2011 Workshop
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT FORM

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Nell Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744

Are you a public official or public official representative? Yes [ ] No [X] Position: [ ]

Name and Mailing Address (Optional):
Name: BARBARA LEWIS
Affiliation: SENATOR MIKE JACKSON
Address: 1109 FAIRMONT PARKWAY FRANKSTON
Email Address: BARBARA.LEWIS@SENATE.STA. TX 7758
Telephone: 713 948 - 9111

What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:

I am in favor of dry berthing. I was in a meeting several years ago when this solution was discussed. Citizens will come to visit. Good PR program needed. Younger citizens are unaware the Battleship is located here or even know about the Battleships or the monument.
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Are you a public official or public official representative? Yes [ ] No [X] Position

Name and Mailing Address (Optional):
Name: [Redacted]
Affiliation: San Jacinto Texas Historic District, and the Economic Alliance
Address: [Redacted]
Email Address: [Redacted]
Telephone: [Redacted]

What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here: - We should dry berth the Texas right where she is; per the will of the Texas voters.
- I would not consider moving her. There is no legitimate reason to move the Texas, nor is there money, resources or a location to move her to. Furthermore, moving the Texas from this site would devastate the clustered tourism assets at the park.
- I fully support dry berthing the Texas in order to permanently preserve her for future generations of Texans.
- Those individuals promoting relocating the Texas do not have the best interest of the ship in mind, but rather a goal of removing her from the battle ground.
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry berthing in current location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing the project in budget</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department  
ATTN: Neil Thomas  
4200 Smith School Road  
Austin, TX 78744  
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
The ship must be repaired and preserved via a dry berth. Her historical/cultural importance is too great to contemplate otherwise.

The only consideration I would give to relocating her would be to increase visitation. However, I know of no other location available and reachable— in which she will be as protected. Other locations leave her more exposed to weather/environment. She should be remain at San Jacinto.

Dry berthing is the only real solution to preservation. Exposure to breakwater water is progressively destroying her.

The ship has become part & parcel of San Jacinto over the decades. A berth exists here; no new funding needs to found to obtain another.
There is no conflict in a 20th century ship lying adjacent to a 19th century battlefield. History is a continuum, and as long as we place and arrange appropriately, the history and heritage can be displayed in perfect harmony.

List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank these issues in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry berth to ensure preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site selection - current location is highest but near costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744

Are you a public official or public official representative? □ Yes □ No Position: District Director

Name: Tammie Nielsen
Affiliation: Rep. Ken Legler
Address: 1167 Fairmont Pas, TX 77509
Email Address: tammie.nielson@house.state.tx.us
Telephone: 713 444 1092

* What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
* Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
* Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
* What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
* What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:
1) I believe that Battleship Texas should remain where it is, with area improvements made to increase the desirability for tourism.
2) I believe dry berthing the ship is the best hope of maintaining the integrity of the ship long term for generations to come.
3) The only way I would consider moving the ship is if that was the only way to save it.
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

Project Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding it now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of the Texas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of the Battlesfield</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Considerations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department  
ATTN: Neil Thomas  
4200 Smith School Road  
Austin, TX 78744  
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Battleship TEXAS
Dry Berth Project

May 20, 2011 Workshop
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT FORM

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744

Are you a public official or public official representative? ☐ Yes ☑ No Position: Mayor, Morgan's Pt.

Name and Mailing Address (Optional):
Name: Milo Strickland
Address: 113 Bayridge Rd., Morgan’s Pt., TX 77571-3557
Email Address: surf+dory@mac.com
Telephone: 281-471-2283

* What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
* Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
* Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
* What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
* What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:

- I believe that the TPWD Master Plan should proceed, that the spirit of the will of the voters be recognized and that the Texas be dry berthed in her current location.

- Any move would be both risky and costly and would only benefit a self-serving minority.

- I had the pleasure of a ‘hard hat tour’ of the Texas, along with a German engineer friend and his teenage son. It was an incredible experience. The point here is that, as the last dreadnought, the Texas gets international attention.

- Speaking of, I remember my mother’s Fund raising drive for the Texas, many years ago, where school children contributed small change –
so that the Texas could stay at its present location, as a memorial to those Americans who served their country in two World Wars.

List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

**Project Considerations**

- total cost
- < see item # 1>
- etc.

Ranking

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Are you a public official or public official representative? [ ] Yes [ ] No Position: [ ] Mayor [ ] Pro Tem

Name and Mailing Address (Optional):
Name: Richard Adams
Affiliation: City of Port Aransas
Address: 3419 Bee You Forest Port Aransas, TX 77571
Email Address: firechick1708@yahoo.com
Telephone: 210-747-8888

* What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
* Where would you consider moving her, if you want to move her elsewhere?
* Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
* What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
* What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

Provide general comments here:

1. I would like to see the ship beached at its present location.
   Fill in the ship from the channel with dirt, add a surface of some type and display the ship out of the salt water.

2. I would not move her. I know some consider it sacred ground for the battle and deaths of soldiers, but the current location is easy to access and familiar to most.

3. Yes to dry berthing. The salt water will ruin her.

4. I am a contributing member of the Battleship Texas Foundation, we must save this beautiful dreadnought!
List your top ten (10) most important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

**Project Considerations**

1. Preserve her in current location, it has been here for many years. Keep bringing tourists to Galveston, not Houston.
2. Do not tow her.
3. Keep her in current location, it has been here for many years. Keep bringing tourists to Galveston, not Houston.
4. Promote her history and presence.
5. Advertise the Battleship Texas Foundation more.
6. Earnest a Battleship Texas Day, big party, etc.
7. Do not tow her.
8. Promote her history and presence.
9. Keep her in current location, it has been here for many years. Keep bringing tourists to Galveston, not Houston.
10. Preserve her in current location, it has been here for many years. Keep bringing tourists to Galveston, not Houston.

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ATTN: Neil Thomas
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
The Battleship Texas should be dry-berthed and remain in its current location. It is a key attraction to the San Jacinto Monument area. The Battleship Texas represents the same sense of freedom and protecting the country as does the San Jacinto Monument itself. They mirror the same ideals carried through time by generations of Texans. Moving Battleship Texas would diminish the synergy of both monuments to freedom.
List your top ten (10) important issues to be considered for this project here. Following this, please rank the issues listed in order of importance from 1 to 10. (1 is highest priority and 10 is lowest priority.)

**Project Considerations**

1. Preserve Texas History from all eras
2. Maintain clustered historical assets to increase attracting visitors from distant areas
3. Maintain clustered historical assets for greater site impact
4. Make available to the public
5. Serve public good economically

This comment form may be turned in today, or it may be mailed or emailed by May 30, 2011, to the address below:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department  
ATTN: Neil Thomas  
4200 Smith School Road  
Austin, TX 78744  
Email: info@dryberthtexas.com
Dear Neil,

Attached is my blue attendance card. I have also copied Leslie from Crouch Environmental who I believe was collecting cards.

I took my card from the meeting because I wanted to add the address of Cecil Jones and all of his contact information. He should be added to the project mailing list. In addition, you should contact:

Krista Gebbia
% Preservation Texas

to see if her group wants to participate as a consulting party. I know Krista is busy in Austin, at present, since this session of the legislature is winding down and critical budget issues remain.

I was very, very disappointed in the format of the meeting, the printed materials, and the fact that the process of “stakeholder outreach” began without a NAVSEA representative or a member of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in attendance.

Best,

Jan

Jan DeVault
SAN JACINTO BATTLEGROUND ASSOCIATION
d/b/a Friends of the San Jacinto Battleground

PRIVATE CONTACT INFORMATION REDACTED FROM PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Color</th>
<th>Names of Group Members</th>
<th>Group Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Green**   | Don Fischer, Larry Spasic, Chad Burke, Kelly Little | 1. Repair and preserve her in a dry berth in her current location.  
2. Moving her is not a viable option. It had to be moved, it must be a place that is close, safe, financially feasible, and one that increased visitorship.  
   - Moving the TEXAS from its site would devastate the clustered tourism assets at the park.  
   - Overwhelming regional opinion is to keep and dry berth her at the current site.  
3. Yes, this group is in favor of leaving her in her current location.  
4. It's feasible, most efficient and within the financial resources available that have already been provided.  
5. Moving the ship provides substantial risk to the ship as well as the Houston Ship Channel.  
   - No money, or organization exists to move, locate or house the TEXAS.  
   - While the ship is a 20th Century artifact, lying adjacent a 19th Century battlefield, they represent no conflict, but rather compliment one another in depicting our history/heritage.  
   - The people of Texas saved and brought the battleship to the park on purpose.  
   - The potential risk of the TEXAS sinking during a move would be catastrophic to the state and nation's economy - approximately $1 billion economic impact per day if the Houston Ship Channel is closed.  
   - The estimate to move the ship a short distance and re-create its existing slip condition is between $15-20 million, which doesn't include costs to repair the ship enough to be towed; that money is not available. |
| **Blue**    | Marie Taylor, Garry McMahan, Tamnie Nielsen, Ana Clark, Melissa Boaze, Sam Clark | 1. Table would like to keep it where it is.  
2. We would like to see it dry berthed with the least environmental and historical impact.  
3. We feel dry berthing is the most economical long-term solution.  
4. By keeping it where it is and dry berthing it, we would like to see all alternatives at current location.  
5. What are funding alternatives if we were to move it?  
6. The current location with amenities could be the beginning of other tourist and economic activity in the area.  
7. Being in the "Museum without walls" region (Project Stars) it is an artifact within the "museum" it is an artifact within Project Stars (the Museum 5 Walls). |
| **Red**     | Jerry Androy, Barbara Lewis, Erin Piper, Jeff Dunn, Steven Howell | • Chosen alternative should not have negative impact on battleground or ship.  
• Procedure for moving forward with evaluation process?  
• Feasibility of dry berth - potential impacts from hurricanes, etc. Long-term management of the ship within the dry-berth?  
• Why AECOM evaluating all 4 options when 2 were denied by THC? |
| **Orange**  | Ronald Brown, Adrienne Campbell, Jose Rivera, Donny Taylor | • Preservation of the Battleship is very important.  
• A lot of people would be upset with moving Battleshhip.  
• Table Participants in favor of dry berth in current location.  
• Table Participants feel that dry berthing the ship sounds like the most cost-effective alternative.  
• Important to avoid impact (physical and visual) to cemetery, San Jacinto Battleground.  
• Keep Battleship open during project. |
| **Yellow**  | Phillip Evans, Scott Patrick, Mark Denton, Jan DeVault, Janet Wagner | 1. The group came to a consensus that the Battleship TEXAS should be preserved and protected.  
2. The group did not come to a consensus on this question but here are the suggestions:  
   - Turning Basin in Houston  
   - Along the Texas Coast  
3. The group did not come to a consensus on this question but here are the suggestions:  
   - Depends on the design of the dry berth.  
   - A suitable and feasible alternative location can be found.  
4. Show us some designs. Very complex engineering designs require more research and knowledge about the process of dry berthing.  
5. Considerations (feedback):  
   - Any possible plan is going to trigger an adverse effect to the Battleship and battlefield.  
   - If relocated it must be relocated to a location with a strong tourist base/economic base.  
   - It appears all the alternatives are going to cost more than the $29 million set aside. Where is the additional money going to come from? |
Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations

Table Color: Dark Blue

Names: Tammie Nielsen, Ana Clark

1. Why would you do with the Battleship Texas?
2. Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
3. Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
4. What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
5. What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

1. Table would like to keep it where it is.
2. We would like to see it dry berthed w/ the least environmental & historical impact.
3. We feel dry berthing is the most economical long-term solution.
4. By keeping it where it is, dry berthing it, we would like to see all alternatives @ current location.
5. What are funding alternatives if we were to move it?
6. The current location @eminent could be the beginning of other tourist / economic activity in the area.
7. Being in the "Museum without Walls" region (Project Stars), it is an artifact within the "museum".

It is an artifact within Project Stars (the museum of walls)
Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations

Table Color Names: Dark Green

1. What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
   2. Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
   3. Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
   4. What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
   5. What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

1) Repair and preserve her in her current location.
2) Moving her is not a viable option; if it had to be moved, it must be a place that is close, safe, financially feasible, and one that increased visitorship.
   - Moving the Texas from its site would devastate the clustered tourism assets at the park.
   - Overwhelming regional opinion is to keep and dry berth her at the current site.
3) Yes, this group is in favor of keeping her in her current location.
4) It's feasible, most efficient, and within the financial resources available that have already been provided.
5) Moving the ship provides substantial risk to the ship as well as the Houston Ship Channel.
   - No money or organization exists to move, locate or house the Texas.
   - While the ship is a 20th Century artifact, lying adjacent a 19th Century battlefield, they represent NO conflict, but rather complement one another in depicting our history/heritage.
   - The people of Texas saved and brought the Battleship to the park on purpose.
   - The potential risk of the Texas sinking during a move would be catastrophic to the state.
Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations

The nation's economy—approximately $1 billion economic impact per day if the Houston Ship Channel is closed.

- The estimate to move the ship a short distance and re-create its existing condition is between $15-20 million, which doesn't include costs to repair the ship enough to be towed; that money is not available.
**Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations**

| Table Color | Orange | Names: | Ker Brown, Brian Campbell, Josué Rivera, Dennis Taylor |

- What would you do with the Battleship Texas?
- Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?
- Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?
- What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?
- What other valuable feedback do you have for us?

- Preservation of the battleship is very important.
- A lot of people would be upset if moving the battleship.
- Table participants in favor of dry berth in current location.
- Table participants in favor of leaving in current location.
- Table participants feel that dry berthing the ship sounds like the most effective alternative.
- Important to avoid impact (physical and visual) to Battleship Texas and need to keep Battleship open during project.

...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Color</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What would you do with the Battleship Texas?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where would you consider moving her, if you were to move her elsewhere?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you in favor of leaving the Battleship Texas in her current location?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is your impression of the idea of dry berthing the ship?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What other valuable feedback do you have for us?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations

- Chosen alternative should not have negative impact on battlefield or ship.
- Procedure for moving forward with evaluation process?
- Feasibility of dry berth potential impacts from hurricanes, etc.
- Long-term management of the ship within the dry berth?
- Why AECOM evaluating all 4 options when 2 were denied by THC.
Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations

1) The group came to a consensus that the Battleship Texas should be preserved and protected.

2) The group did not come to a consensus on this question, but here are the suggestions:
   a) Downtown Houston
   b) Along the Texas Coast

3) The group did not come to a consensus on this question, but here are the suggestions:
   a) Depends on the design of the Dry Berth
   b) A suitable and feasible alternative location can be found

4) Show us some designs. Very complex engineering designs require more research and knowledge about the process of dry berthing.

5) Considerations (Feedback):
   a) Any possible plan is going to trigger an adverse effect to the Battleship as Battlesfield
   b) If relocated, it must be relocated to a location on stem tourist base, economic base
   c) It appears all the alternatives are going to cost more than the $19 million set aside. Where is the additional money going to come from?
Individual Oral Comment Summary

May 20, 2011 Oral Comments Received from Attendees:

- **Concerns** – Financing issues associated with the preservation of this ship
  » Loss of opportunity to preserve the ship with a realistic solution
  - Larry Spasic, San Jacinto Museum of History Association

- **Question** – Are there any studies that show dry berthing as an effective, long-term solution for preservation of the ship?
  - Jerry Androy, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Galveston District

- **Resolution** – Desire to see this process address the issue of the final location of the battleship, desire to see the ship preserved.
  - Steven Howell, Battleship TEXAS Foundation

- **Requirements beyond NEPA and NHPA to find a solution**
  » Put forth a good faith effort to find a final solution
  » Research outside partnership opportunities (beyond TPWD stewardship) for preservation of TEXAS
  - Jeff Dunn, formerly of San Jacinto Historical Advisory Board

- **Financing** – State monies have been appropriated to preserve the ship in its current location; no other sources of funding have been identified to preserve the ship at this time.
  - Chad Burke, Economic Alliance Houston Port Region

- **Complexity of issues at hand** – considering two unique historic sites
- **Continue transparency throughout process**
  » Request for further information as the process moves forward (details specifically)
  » Concern that information is not being shared throughout this process
  - Jan DeVault, San Jacinto Battleground Association (both comments)

- **Clarification** – NEPA process requirements to consider alternatives as part of this project
  - Adrienne Campbell, Texas Historical Commission

- **Question** – Is the allotted funding still available to conduct this project? How will recent budget cuts change the scope of state operations and, in particular, this project?
  - Mark Denton, Texas Historical Commission

- **Comment** – Transparency felt, participation in process, and gratitude for time at this meeting.
  - Larry Spasic, San Jacinto Museum of History Association
Stakeholder Workshop Photographs

The TPWD Project Team kicks off the workshop.

The TPWD Project Team kicks off the workshop.
The TPWD Project Team presents the workshop format to the attendees.

TPWD staff discuss the project with workshop attendees.
A workshop attendee reviews the Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations handout.
Workshop attendees discuss project considerations at the “red” table.

TPWD staff discuss the project with the “yellow” table.
Workshop attendees and a TPWD Project Team member discuss the project at the “red” table.

Workshop attendees develop Group Consensus Plans and Recommendations.
A workshop attendee provides feedback and recommendations from the “yellow” table.

A workshop attendee provides individual oral comments.