
**Open House Summary
Comment and Response Report
For the Oak Hill Parkway
Open House held on January 20, 2015**



OAK HILL
P A R K W A Y

U.S. Highway 290 (US 290) / State Highway (SH) 71 West
from State Loop 1 (MoPac) to Ranch-to-Market (RM) 1826
and from US 290 to Silvermine Drive
Travis County, Texas

**Prepared for
Federal Highway Administration and
Texas Department of Transportation
May 2015**





OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY

Table of Contents

Open House Meeting Report.....	1
Comment and Response Report	6

List of Attachments

- Attachment A Advertisement of Open House
- Attachment B Email Announcements
- Attachment C Additional Announcements
- Attachment D Open House Display Boards
- Attachment E Open House Handout Materials
- Attachment F Open House Photographs
- Attachment G Open House Sign-in Sheets
- Attachment H Virtual Open House Information
- Attachment I Written Comments
- Attachment J Court Reporter Comment Transcript



Open House Summary

The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority (Mobility Authority) held an Open House on Jan. 20, 2015 to gather input regarding the Oak Hill Parkway Study, U.S. Highway (US) 290/State Highway (SH) 71 West in Oak Hill. The meeting presented the opportunity to review and comment on the revised alternatives; discuss Context Sensitive Solutions and gather additional public input on the project.

The meeting was held from 4:30-7 p.m. in the Covington Middle School Cafeteria, 3700 Convict Hill Rd., Austin, Texas 78749.

Study Summary

Highway/Project Study Area

Possible improvements to US 290/SH 71 West in Travis County, Texas are being evaluated. The project limits extend on US 290 from State Loop 1 (MoPac) to Ranch-to-Market (RM) 1826 and on SH 71 from US 290 to Silvermine Drive. The study corridor is approximately 3.6 miles along US 290 and 1.2 miles along SH 71.

Proposed Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed improvements is to:

- Improve mobility and operational efficiency
- Promote long-term congestion management
- Increase multimodal travel options for people and goods
- Improve safety
- Improve emergency response

The need for the proposed improvements are:

- Traffic congestion related to population growth—Travis County has grown from 212,000 in 1960 to just over one million in 2010
- Crashes on US 290/SH 71 West—More than 300 collisions were reported within the project limits between 2009 and 2011 resulting in one fatality, nine incapacitating injuries, other injuries and property damage
- Lost time—drivers waste more than 340,000 hours per year stuck in traffic
- Lack of reliable connectivity
- Unreliable route for transit and emergency vehicles



Goals for Possible Improvements

During the environmental study process, the project team is gathering input from neighbors and drivers to identify a long-term solution to mobility needs in the corridor that:

- Respects the environment and improves mobility
- Promotes sustainable growth by incorporating elements from the Green Mobility Challenge
- Is consistent with and supports community goals for the enhancement of Oak Hill
- Moves more people safely and reliably, not just more vehicles

Open House Information

Advertisements

Color display advertisements were published in the December 2014 issue of the Community Impact Newspaper (Southwest Austin Edition); the Oak Hill Gazette on Jan. 8, 2015; the Lake Travis View on Jan. 15, 2015; and the Driftwood News Dispatch on Jan. 15, 2015.

Copies of the display ads, tear sheets and affidavits are included in **Attachment A**.

Email Announcements

Two email announcements regarding the Open House were distributed to individuals and groups in the study database:

- Email announcement #1 was sent on Dec. 19, 2014 to 893 recipients
- Email announcement #2 was sent on Jan. 26, 2015 to 894 recipients

The Open House was also promoted in email newsletters:

- The Oak Hill Parkway email newsletter promoted the Open House and was distributed on Jan. 14, 2015
- The city of Austin also promoted the Open House twice in their email newsletters, Austin Mobility go!, distributed on Dec. 29, 2014 and Jan. 20, 2015.

Copies of the email announcements are available in **Attachment B**.

Additional Notification/Outreach Efforts

A news release announcing the Open House was distributed to Austin-area news media by the Mobility Authority and TxDOT on Jan. 13, 2015. The news release was also posted on the Mobility Authority website (www.MobilityAuthority.com). TxDOT also released a notification on its website (www.txdot.gov) announcing the Open House meeting on Jan. 20, 2015.



Multiple Twitter announcements promoting the Open House were distributed by the Mobility Authority during the period of Jan. 13-20, 2015.

Multiple Twitter announcements promoting the Virtual Open House and public involvement opportunities following the Jan. 20 Open House were distributed by the Mobility Authority during the period of Jan. 21-30, 2014. The Twitter announcements were also posted on the project Twitter page (<https://twitter.com/OakHillParkway>). Copies of the news release and Twitter feeds are available in **Attachment C**.

In addition, a changeable message board was displayed along US 290 in Oak Hill.

Open House Date, Location, Format, Boards and Maps

The Open House was held Tuesday, Jan. 20, 2015, in the Covington Middle School Cafeteria, 3700 Convict Hill Rd., Austin, Texas 78749. The meeting was held from 4:30-7 p.m. utilizing an open house, come-and-go format where the public was able to review project exhibits and discuss the environmental study process with project staff.

There were 20 informational boards displayed for public viewing including information about screening criteria, Alternative A, Alternative C, Context Sensitive Solutions, how public input has shaped the process and general information about the study. Schematic drawings of the two alternatives considered during the study were also on display.

Representatives from TxDOT, the Mobility Authority and the study team were positioned around the room to answer questions, facilitate discussion and gather input from attendees. In addition, stations were set up by representatives from TxDOT Intersection Improvements, Mobility Authority, Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization and city of Austin to provide information.

The information boards are included in **Attachment D**.

Registration and Handouts

Upon arrival at the Open House, attendees were asked to sign in and were offered a set of handouts which included:

- Welcome letter containing information about the Virtual Open House
- Fact sheet
- Community Survey form
- Comment form

The Open House handout materials are available in **Attachment E**.



Attendance

A total of 109 people signed in at the Open House, including 107 citizens from the general public, two elected official and 30 staff members.

Photographs taken at the open house are available in **Attachment F**.

Sign-in sheets for the Open House Meeting are included as **Attachment G**.

Virtual Open House

The Virtual Open House on the project website (www.OakHillParkway.com) was available for public view Jan. 20-30, 2015. Each exhibit displayed at the Open House meeting was available for view as a PDF file, and links were provided for participants to submit official comments and fill out the Community Survey (through survey website SurveyMonkey). The January 20 Open House attendees were notified of the Virtual Open House through the welcome letter handout.

The Virtual Open House recorded 457 unique page views during the ten days it was available for view. A Google Analytics report on Virtual Open House page views is included as **Attachment H**.

Public Comment Summary

The official public comment period for the Jan. 20, 2015 Open House ran Dec. 18, 2014-Jan. 30, 2015. Members of the public could submit remarks in various methods during the official comment period including:

- Submitting a written comment form in person at the Open House
- Providing a verbal comment to the court reporter at the Open House
- Mailing a written comment to TxDOT Austin District Environmental Coordinator, Texas Department of Transportation, P.O. Drawer 15426, Austin, Texas, 78761-5426
- Faxing a comment to 512-832-7157
- Submitting a comment through the website at www.OakHillParkway.com

There were 74 comments received during the official comment period. The table on the following page shows the number of comment submissions and method by which they were submitted. A summary of the comments received and a response to the comment follows this table in the Comment and Response Report.



Comment Submissions during the January 20, 2015 Open House Comment Period	
Submission Method	Total Comments
Written Comments (including comment forms and hand written comments)	37
Court Reporter Transcriptions	4
Webmail Submissions	33
Total Comments	74

Comment forms are available as **Attachment I**.

The Court Reporter transcript is included in **Attachment J**.

Comment and Response Report

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
1	NA	NA	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Pleased with open house and knowledgeable staff.	Comment noted.
2	Anderson	Traci	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Oak Hill Youth Sports Association would like to discuss Joe Tanner intersection. Would like to know vehicle counts for intersection.	Our team will contact the OHYSA for a meeting. Traffic counts will be obtained for the Joe Tanner intersection.
3	Baccus	Buck	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Supports Concept A or C.	Comment noted.
4	Baucher	Brian	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Alternative A. Better for neighborhood and access to shopping.	Comment noted.
5	Beckett	Jim	1/23/2015	Comment Form	Pros: Displays, maps, people available for questions. Still concerned about runoff, disability access, noise, and cut-through traffic. Will this improve mass transit efficiency?	As the environmental study progresses, more information will be provided regarding these issues.
6	Beversdorff	Bill	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Would like a U-turn from westbound 71 to eastbound 71 leaving the HEB.	Both Alternatives A and C provide the requested U-turn.
7	Cassell	Dwight	1/20/2015	Comment Form	The dual level Y intersection funded in 1982 was killed by political pressure from local residents because it might remove large amount of trees. Selfishness overriding needs of multi-thousands.	Comment noted.
8	Detloff	Ralph	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Alternatives A and C acceptable; no-build is unacceptable	Comment noted.
9	Good	Kevin	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Good presentations; both build alternatives preserves best area features, address community concerns	Comment noted.
10	Goodloe	Diana	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Progress is being made, but traffic still slow. Lane markers and signs are difficult to see at night and in the rain.	Comment noted.
11	Gray	Patricia	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Alternative A or C is acceptable. Grateful Circle Drive at 290 is being addressed. Concerned about water flow and flooding at the Y.	Comment noted. As the environmental study progresses more information will be provided regarding drainage.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
12	Gray	Robert	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Alternative C. Alternative A will flood at the Y. Move ramp at Monterrey Oaks back west.	Our preliminary hydraulic finding indicates that Alternative A's depressed mainlanes at the Y can be adequately drained to Williamson Creek near William Cannon Drive via a storm drainage system. There is approximately 20' of fall between the Y and William Cannon Dr. We need clarification on the Monterrey Oaks ramp relocation comment.
13	Hall	Bill	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Alternative C is a good design and should be built.	Comment noted.
14	Kallerman	Dick	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Biased evaluation eliminated Alternative F. The continuous flow lanes interim fix is sufficient for 20 years. Put Alternatives A and C on hold for 10 years.	Concept F was eliminated because it did not have a continuous frontage road system, which would have reduced mobility as well as an effective, reliable emergency route. Traffic projections show volume will exceed capacity in a few years and continuous flow lane improvements will not serve the long-term needs of the community.
15	Lancaster	Julia A.	1/29/2015	Comment Form	Glad residents of Oak Hill care about the community. Grateful to the City of Austin, TxDOT, and other entities have listened to concerns of citizens.	Comment noted.
16	Lehman	Paul	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Do as much as possible to alleviate flooding along Williamson Creek. Build a pond at Freescale, east of William Cannon/west of Patton Ranch Road, possibly with park and mixed use trail.	We are investigating various methods of reducing the flow and flooding along Williamson Creek. Both Alternatives include a shared-use trail east of William Cannon Drive.
17	Lievens	Linda	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Against tolls. Consider other funding options such as gas tax, property tax increase, etc. Cut-through traffic in neighborhoods/large tolled overpasses will ruin community feel of Oak Hill.	While the ultimate funding decision has not been determined, CAMPO's long range transportation plan identifies tolling as the funding source for the Oak Hill Parkway. Because transportation funding is limited and CAMPO's plan includes tolled lanes, tolling some element of the project will likely be considered. Per state law, if tolling is used to fund improvements to US 290 and SH 71, the same number of existing non-tolled lanes would remain, in addition to any new tolled lanes.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
18	Marburger	Noah	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Option C.	Comment noted.
19	Maxfield	Liz	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Minimize cut-through traffic in Scenic Brook, Covered Bridge neighborhoods. Must address Y at Oak Hill. Doing nothing is not an option.	Comment noted.
20	Meade	Ron	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Appreciates the degree of stakeholder input considered. Process has been inclusive. Community meetings have been informative and well-staffed by knowledgeable representatives.	Comment noted.
21	Moore	Jake	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Very good job reaching out to the public.	Comment noted.
22	Morrison	Pat	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Alternative A. Simple design. Less overpasses.	Comment noted.
23	O'Sullivan	John	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Alternative A. Less noise and light pollution for Oak Hill Heights.	Comment noted.
24	Perkins	Rick	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Alternative A. Keep "dark sky" lighting.	Comment noted. As the environmental study progresses, more information will be provided regarding highway lighting.
25	Pruett	Darryl	1/20/2015	Comment Form	(Resolution submitted on behalf of Oak Hill Association of Neighborhoods) Community requests CTRMA/local officials to fund/build improvements to US 290 and SH 71 to reduce traffic congestion, improve public safety, and meet community expectations. The Association unanimously supports project and requests consolidation of attached guidelines into project design.	Comment noted. Thank you for the guidelines you submitted.
26	Rathod	Sanjay	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Appreciates regular open houses. Prefers Alternative A. Expedite decision making process via frequent meetings once EIS is completed.	Comment noted.
27	Robinson	Patricia	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Project should provide equal or better access from side roads and neighborhoods. If Alternative C is selected, add U-turn close to Bee Caves Road as shown on Alternative A.	Unfortunately the requested U-turn is not possible for Alternative C due to conflicts with the US 290 westbound frontage road and the SH 71 depressed direct connector ramp. Traffic would

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
						need to utilize the SH 71 U-turn at Scenic Brook Drive.
28	Rusthoven	Jerry	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Alternative A. Keep flyovers as low as possible due to noise/visual impact. Avoid wide dead zone below elevated freeway such as Ben White at Manchaca and Victory Lane.	Comment noted.
29	Schroeder	Ken	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Open house was very helpful.	Comment noted.
30	Schroeder	Nancy	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Forum very informative; helpful to have many people to answer questions.	Comment noted.
31	Short	Van	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Alternative C. Alternative A will cost more to construct, be more disruptive, take longer to construct, be more difficult to modify in the future, and cost more to maintain because of drainage and groundwater.	As the environmental study progresses, more information will be provided regarding these issues.
32	Thomas	C.R.	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Interim improvements have been great! Looking forward to William Cannon/290 improvements. Please keep pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the plans. Would like to bike between Granada Hills neighborhood and HEB/Planet Fitness.	Comment noted.
33	Thornton	Ken	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Save the three large oak trees at William Cannon/290. Crews should work at night to minimize daytime traffic interruption. Move forward more quickly. Prefers least footprint. Elevated option could be better at the Y.	Comment noted.
34	Vosburgh	Valerian	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Make presentations easier to see, compare and analyze. When/how will decision between A and C be made? What could impact the schedule? What are major differences between the two alternatives (visually, mapped highlights, etc.) How many trees will be planted?	As the environmental study progresses more information will be provided to aid in the decision. The next open house is anticipated in the summer of 2015 to present the information. After evaluation of the study results, the team will make a recommendation between the alternatives and obtain public comments. A public hearing will be held in 2016, everything will be documented in the Environmental Impact Statement, and then a record of decision will be made by TxDOT by

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
						early 2017. At this time we do not know how many trees will be planted as part of project.
35	Wolter	Susan	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Upset by the change in Alternative A. Against tolls. Against "concrete ceiling" over roadway.	Comment noted.
36	Wukasch	Walter	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Do not move westbound SH 71 direct connector any further west. Maintain access to Plaza 71 building.	Comment noted. We will keep this in mind as the schematic is finalized.
37	Wukasch	Don C.	1/20/2015	Comment Form	Prefers Alternative A. Wants at least 200 feet between end of ramp exiting westbound 71 direct connector.	Comment noted. We will keep this in mind as the schematic is finalized.
38	Simanton	Don	12/19/2014	Web Mail	Disappointed public meetings are held at middle schools. They provide inadequate parking, limit amount of people willing to attend.	We welcome public input; our intent is to encourage open house participation. We moved to Covington at the public's suggestion since it had front, back and side street parking.
39	Hollinger	Howard	12/19/2014	Web Mail	What is total costs of employees and consultants on this project, including all expenses, reimbursable expenses, and additional services from consultants from the first action to today?	We do not have that information available.
40	Wagner	Charles	12/19/2014	Web Mail	Would like to understand timeline of the interim projects. Found information on the improvements page of this website: http://www.oakhillparkway.com/about/improvements.php Questions: 1. Phase 1 and Phase 2 do not appear to be defined. Is there a definition of what has been completed and what is next? 2. Continuous Flow lights have been erected at the intersection of 290 and 71. When will continuous flow at 290 and 71 be utilized?	The interim intersection improvement projects in Oak Hill will improve mobility and safety in the Oak Hill area until a long-term solution can be implemented. Phase one includes dual left-turn lanes at three locations: RM 1826, the entrance to Austin Community College, and Convict Hill Road. Phase one also includes a center-turn lane between RM 1826 and Convict Hill Road. Phase two is the construction of innovative intersections at SH 71, William Cannon and Joe Tanner. The continuous flow intersection at US 290 and SH 71 is expected to be operational in early May.
41	Nelson	Richard	1/14/2015	Web Mail	Has experienced the congestion at the Y. Would like the project to get done soon.	Comment noted.
42	Dunn	Cliff	1/14/2015	Web Mail	Unhappy with project. Congestion in Oak Hill area due to funds stolen from the project years ago. Wants the flyover that was paid for.	Transportation funds were diverted from Oak Hill to other transportation projects due to a lack of clear consensus on what to do. We are now

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
						working with citizens and businesses to improve long-range mobility in the region and to secure funding for those improvements.
43	Schoelzel	Cyndie	1/17/2015	Web Mail	Wants bicycle lanes, not a trail behind his home. Against additional property or road taxes/tolls. Wants improved drainage; against aesthetic enhancements. Would like roads to be built soon. Supports safety barrier and U-turn lanes or some way to get off road sooner for an alternate route in the event of a wreck or missed a turn.	Comment noted. Public input has shown that bicycle/pedestrian improvements in Oak Hill is an important priority for the community. Bicyclists have told us they prefer separate facilities rather than bike lanes along the side of the highway. While nothing in finalized, pedestrian tunnels, sidewalks, shared use paths, and bicycle lanes are being considered along the corridor. Regarding project funding, see comment 17. We are investigating various methods of reducing the flow and flooding along Williamson Creek. Aesthetic enhancements are an ongoing discussion with the community. Two public workshops have already been held on the issue and a third aesthetic workshop will be held later this year. A continuous frontage road system is being considered in Oak Hill, which would enhance mobility as well as provide an effective, reliable emergency route.
44	Batchelor	Jeffrey	1/23/2015	Web Mail	Concerned about noise, aesthetic, and light pollution impact on surrounding neighborhoods. Would like trenching to be considered; a tunnel would also work. Existing proposals take too much from local population; give too much to the remote population. Would like a better balance.	As the environmental study progresses, more information will be provided regarding these issues. Regarding "trenching", much of Alternatives A and C west of the Y includes depressed mainlanes under the cross streets. Additionally, Alternative A is depressed at the Y. Tunneling the entire route is not a feasible solution.
45	Richardson	David	1/24/2015	Web Mail	Prefers Concept C. Limited access to the shopping/strip center where HEB is located. Wants better solution for ingress. A curb cut from Old Bee Cave Road into the back of shopping center would allow trucks to enter/exit more easily. TxDOT and CTRMA should align	Comment noted. Our team will continue working with businesses, especially those near the Y, to improve access. We will also investigate improvements to the U-turn and frontage roads near Scenic Brook Dr.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
					their design with community interests such as redevelopment and revitalizing commercial entities. Due to the yield sign at the Texas Turnaround from WB 290 to EB 290 frontage road, WB and EB frontage road traffic will increase over time. Add an acceleration lane to design or merge all EB frontage road traffic into the right lane west of Scenic Brook.	
46	Borrello	John	1/25/2015	Web Mail	Prefers Alternative A.	Comment noted.
47	Thayer	Tom	1/25/2015	Web Mail	Concerned about the bike/ped design at the Y. Wants grade separation for bike/ped traffic; a tunnel or bridge would be sufficient. West of the Y, need warning signage for bike/ped traffic crossing the driveways. Disappointed by similarity of options A and C. Wants design changes considered due to tolling. Both options treat Williamson Creek badly; will destroy natural character. Community wants to save the oaks and the creeks.	Comments and suggestions noted. We will investigate the bicyclist/pedestrian grade separation at the Y for Alternative A (it is not possible for Alternative C). The final design of the shared use path would determine appropriate signage for users. Regarding tolling, it is a funding mechanism, not an alternative. We are working with the Austin Heritage Tree Society and the city of Austin to develop a tree plan for inclusion in the Environmental Impact Statement to preserve as many of the large oak trees as possible. We will adhere to city of Austin and Texas Commission on Environmental Quality wetland protection and water quality requirements and hope to enhance the creek area with inclusion of a shared use path along the creek.
48	Halpin	Beki	1/25/2015	Web Mail	Concerned emergency access in Alternative A and C is limited and unsafe. Unhappy over removal of grand historic trees in both options and heavy impact to Williamson Creek; its beauty will be decimated. Against elevated section from Scenic Brook east on 71 all the way to the Williamson Creek crossing. Concerned about noise and light pollution; the elevation increases air pollution for neighborhoods nearby. These options are so	Emergency access will be improved as there will no longer be a deadlock traffic condition as currently exists. Impacts to trees is unavoidable, but will be minimized to the extent possible. Our team is currently working with the city of Austin and Austin Heritage Oaks Society to identify trees that are good candidates for relocation and developing a mitigation plan for trees that cannot be avoided or relocated. Impacts to Williamson Creek have not been measured yet as the plan is

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
					similar to rejected 2007 design; process has had a similar result. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent on staff/consultants to drag citizens through tens of thousands of hours for marginally productive input. Two options now are very similar to 2007 option, a waste of everyone's precious resources and demonstrates bad faith. A broken process.	still being developed, as well as other impacts. Both Alternatives A and C developed in the past two years differ greatly from the plan rejected in 2007. The height of the interchange at the Y is reduced by one level; less above-grade roadway - all grade separations west of the Y have US 290 under the crossing roadways, Williamson Creek will be much less impacted, and a shared use path is being planned for the entire corridor.
49	Koeninger	Patty	1/26/2015	Web Mail	Too many trees will be lost near the creek and Joe Tanner grove will be eliminated. Prefers the parkway concept that was eliminated. Concerned there will be run off and pollution for the creek. Against elevated roadway. Concerned the natural beauty of the area at the Y will be lost.	Comment noted. As the project progresses, more information will be made available regarding the loss of trees. The Joe Tanner grove in the middle of US 290 cannot be avoided. We are working with the Austin Heritage Tree Society and the city of Austin to develop a mitigation tree plan for inclusion in the Environmental Impact Statement to preserve as many of the large oak trees as possible. Additionally, we will adhere to water quality regulations per the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality to appropriately treat roadway stormwater runoff before entering any creeks.
50	Melton	Bruce	1/26/2015	Web Mail	Half of the businesses in Oak Hill have been removed. Environmental duties were not met. Community told there would be minimized elevation in designs; new alternatives are elevated for 1.6 miles through the heart of community. Community told creek would be protected; both alternatives bracket the creek with concrete. Community told Oak Hill oaks would be protected; new alternatives remove dozens of heritage oaks. Community told a parkway section is unsafe because of long detour routes; those detour routes are almost identical and some shorter than on the Parkway section of MoPac between the Lake and 45th	Alternative A and C will not require the relocation of any businesses. The environmental evaluation of the alternatives are just beginning and results will be made public for review and comment. Lower height facilities are proposed as compared to the previous alternatives in 2007. We are in the process of determining the extent of changes to Williamson Creek. Impacts to trees have not been assessed yet; heritage oak trees will be avoided where possible and relocation and/or mitigation of tree loss will be made. The previous Concept F "parkway" was eliminated in the screening process partly for lack of good emergency detour routes because of no parallel frontage roads. It

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
					Street. Community told mainlanes would be realigned to save Joe Tanner Oak Grove; entire grove will be removed. Westbound lane realignment will cause removal of half or more trees on Freescale side of the creek, including many heritage trees. Realignment of William Cannon will destroy the second largest grove of heritage oaks in Oak Hill. Widened footprint of Bee Caves Road will take out pecan grove between the historic low water crossing and the Y. Concrete will be on top of the only live spring with ferns in Oak Hill. Both alternatives now require an additional \$50 million to relocate the 245 Kv transmission main on Freescale property. A pumping system has not been considered to depress the main lanes of 290 at William Cannon. Community was told the Central Texas TxDOT region has no pumps.	also had the lowest ranking on travel time for the westbound mainlanes and the largest number of commercial displacements. We are unaware of any commitment to save the Joe Tanner grove of trees. Due to their location they are unavoidable - see discussion above on comment 49. Tree impacts and final configuration of roadways along Williamson Creek are not complete. The realignment of William Cannon Drive is derived from the Concept F alignment. Heritage oak trees will be avoided where possible. Consultation of the Austin Heritage Oaks Society indicates that the pecan grove in the vicinity of Bee Caves Road is of declining quality. The design of the bridge and Williamson Creek improvements in the Old Bee Caves Road area have not been completed. If a spring is confirmed, it will be avoided and protected if possible. The transmission line will likely need to be relocated for both alternatives. TxDOT will not further consider a depressed William Cannon Drive option due to other more viable options. Pumping depressed areas, especially those with large quantities of flood waters like Williamson Creek, is not the safest and most efficient use of resources when other alternatives are available.
51	Benner	Sophia	1/26/2015	Web Mail	Wants grade separation for the bike path, tunnel or bridge and safe crossings of shared use path, side roads, and driveways. Wants good signage and a way to slow down turning traffic to make them aware of bikes/peds crossing.	Our team will investigate the bicycle/pedestrian grade separation at the Y for Alternative A; it is not possible for Alternative C.
52	Peyton	Stan	1/26/2015	Web Mail	Half of the businesses in Oak Hill have been removed. Environmental duties were not met. Community told there would be minimized elevation in designs; new alternatives are elevated for 1.6 miles through the heart of	See comment 50.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
					community. Community told creek would be protected; both alternatives bracket the creek with concrete. Community told Oak Hill oaks would be protected; new alternatives remove dozens of heritage oaks. Community told a parkway section is unsafe because of long detour routes; those detour routes are almost identical and some shorter than on the Parkway section of MoPac between the Lake and 45th Street. Community told mainlanes would be realigned to save Joe Tanner Oak Grove; entire grove will be removed. Westbound lane realignment will cause removal of half or more trees on Freescale side of the creek, including many heritage trees. Realignment of William Cannon will destroy the second largest grove of heritage oaks in Oak Hill. Widened footprint of Bee Caves Road will take out pecan grove between the historic low water crossing and the Y. Concrete will be on top of the only live spring with ferns in Oak Hill. Both alternatives now require an additional \$50 million to relocate the 245 Kv transmission main on Freescale property. A pumping system has not been considered to depress the main lanes of 290 at William Cannon. Community was told the Central Texas TxDOT region has no pumps.	
53	Nelson	Richard	1/26/2015	Web Mail	Would like the project to progress quickly.	Comment noted.
54	Wade	Richard	1/27/2015	Web Mail	Lives at 7202 Breezy Pass Cove, 78749. Both Alternative A and C have new frontage road just outside of his fence line. How many feet from fence is the proposed frontage road? Are there plans to build a sound wall to dampen sound and act as a barrier between his property and	The preliminary location of the frontage road is approximately 23 feet from your property line. As part of our environmental study, a noise analysis will be conducted to evaluate the feasibility and reasonableness of providing noise walls adjacent to sensitive receptors, like private residences. This information will be made available at the next

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
					the frontage road? Has two small children; concerned about safety.	open house planned for the Summer 2015. If noise walls are found to be feasible and reasonable, a workshop will be conducted with property owners to determine if the walls are desired, and if so, what they might look like.
55	Sanford	Jack	1/27/2015	Web Mail	Wants a grade separation for bicycle/pedestrian path at 290/71 intersection.	Our team will investigate the bicycle/pedestrian grade separation at the Y for Alternative A; it is not possible for Alternative C.
56	Large	John	1/28/2015	Web Mail	Does not like TxDOT's process for handling the parkway through Oak Hill. Would like the road to be built soon. Does not agree that information or public opinion gathered at the many meetings is making a difference in what design gets built. Reply by email; try to convince me my views are inaccurate.	The project team has conducted a vigorous public involvement process of engaging, listening, and providing concepts to the public that reflect their comments. Nine new concepts were developed after initial public meetings and workshops. These concepts, as well as the previous 2007 alternative and the No-Build alternative, were evaluated against the stated purpose and need for the project. Six build concepts and the No-Build Alternative moved onto more rigorous evaluation that ultimately led to the selection of Alternatives A and C for schematic development and full evaluation. This process has been done with full public oversight and input. Examples of impacts to the alternatives include: lower interchange level at the Y - three levels instead of four; depressed US 290 mainlanes at the Y and at all crossings west of the Y; extension of the project past Circle Drive, realignment of ramps for improved access to ACC and the Circle Drive neighborhood; addition of shared use path facilities throughout the project; business access along SH 71 just north of US 290; efforts to reduced flooding on Williamson Creek through upstream regional detention; and alignments that minimize harm to the Williamson Creek area between Old Bee Caves Road and William Cannon Drive.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
57	Pantell	Susan	1/29/2015	Web Mail	Opposes Alternative A and C. Supports continuing with smaller scale improvements to traffic flow in the area with a true parkway alternative. Alternatives A and C provide insufficient protections to Williamson Creek. Alternative C would create huge visual and noise concerns, and bike/ped access would be completely inadequate. Too many old trees would still be destroyed. The no build option is not a reasonable alternative since there is a serious need for traffic improvements.	Because of the large volume of cars in the project corridor, a smaller scale alternative without grade separations at all major intersections would not meet the purpose and need for the project. See comments above related to impacts.
58	Lois-Borzi	Ana	1/29/2015	Web Mail	Prefers Alternative A. Would like a pedestrian bike bridge that crosses 290 and connects Granada Hills with Scenic View.	Bike lanes will be provided on all bridges over US 290: Convict Hill Rd., RM 1826, Scenic Brook Dr., and Circle Drive) for Alternatives A and C.
59	Brinson	Damon	1/29/2015	Web Mail	Strongly supports Alternative A.	Comment noted.
60	Browning	Dorothy	1/29/2015	Web Mail	Prefers Alternative C; looking forward to either one.	Comment noted.
61	Byrom III	Everett	1/29/2015	Web Mail	Prefers Alternative A; please execute.	Comment noted.
62	Koeninger	Patty	1/30/2015	Web Mail	Work to preserve Williamson Creek and the natural area. Alternatives A and C are hazardous to the creek. Don't pave over the area. Many beautiful trees will be lost; help us save those trees.	Our team will continue to work closely with the community to enhance the natural area of Williamson Creek, save as many of the large oak trees as possible, and mitigate the loss of trees that cannot be avoided.
63	Warren	Robert	1/30/2015	Web Mail	Recommends Alternative A. Wants continued access from Granada Hills to 290.	Comment noted. The Granada Hills community will maintain access to US 290 via El Ray Blvd. The US 290 eastbound frontage road provides access to the mainlane ramps without going through a signalized intersection (east or west).
64	Gray	Kevin	1/30/2015	Web Mail	Prefers No Build Alternative; disappointed in remaining alternatives. Does not want tolls. Options presented destroy many heritage trees. Previous options can solve or at least minimize these problems. Do not need frontage roads; limited access roadway designs without	Comment noted regarding preference for the No Build Alternative. Tolling is a funding mechanism necessary to overcome the shortage of funds for highway construction. There will be an option to utilize frontage roads without tolls. The tree impact study has not been completed. As discussed in

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
					frontage roads in other cities handle large volumes of traffic safely and efficiently. Frontage roads along the existing US 290 path west of William Cannon in Option C, show an eight-lane non-elevated parkway is achievable with minimal effect on Williamson Creek.	previous responses above, efforts are being made to minimize adverse impacts to heritage trees. Our traffic studies have indicated that due to the large volume of traffic and the close proximity of access points, a system of controlled access mainlanes, frontage roads and ramps is required to provide a reasonable level of service and provide a safe route for users. The frontage road system referenced in Alternative C also has mainlanes that are required to make the system work. The frontage roads would be over capacity without the main lanes.
65	Koeninger	Patty	1/30/2015	Web Mail	Prefers No Build Alternative; disappointed in remaining alternatives. Does not want tolls. Options presented destroy many heritage trees. Previous options can solve or at least minimize these problems. Do not need frontage roads; limited access roadway designs without frontage roads in other cities handle large volumes of traffic safely and efficiently. Frontage roads along the existing US 290 path west of William Cannon in Option C, show an eight-lane non-elevated parkway is achievable with minimal effect on Williamson Creek.	See comment 64.
66	Carlson-Duchmann	Jann	1/30/2015	Web Mail	Against Alternative A or C; wants Fix290 Coalition proposal.	Concept F was developed with input from the Fix290 Coalition. Ultimately, Concept F was eliminated because it did not have a continuous frontage road system, which would have reduced mobility as well as an effective, reliable emergency route. Traffic projections show volume will exceed capacity in a few years and continuous flow lane improvements will not serve the long-term needs of the community.
67	Beers	Steve	1/30/2015	Web Mail	Opposes A, C, and No-build. Remaining options unacceptable. Options A and C damage the creek environment and would inflict loss of	The environmental evaluation of Alternative A, Alternative C and the No Build Alternative are just beginning. Related to public input, see comment

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
					property value, human health, and quality of life for adjacent neighborhoods due to highway noise. Public input has been ignored. Wants a grade-level parkway design (six to eight lane freeway without frontage roads). Preserve trees and creek as much as possible. Against tolls. RMA has proven it is incapable of meeting National Environmental Policy Act requirements for a fair EIS.	56. Related to parkway concept, see comment 64. As schematics are further refined, avoidance to impacts to trees and Williamson Creek are important to the team. See comment 64 regarding toll comment.
68	Macauley	David	1/30/2015	Web Mail	Question 17 of the survey is unsatisfactory. Available answers do not include all available funding options including fuel tax increase; legislation to stop raiding the highway fund and diverting money; court Proposition 1 funds. Concept A more acceptable than option C; displeased with the amount of roadway both concepts propose for north side of the creek. Not convinced tolls and continuous frontage roads are necessary. Process has excluded alternative ideas to lower roadway height below proposed 25 feet elevation. Both concepts eliminate the Joe Tanner Grove and a large number of heritage trees.	Suggestions of a "fuel tax increase" and "legislation to stop raiding the highway fund and diverting money" would require legislative action before it could be implemented. Both options were covered in the available survey answer, "Wait until the legislature provides new options for funding transportation improvements." For fiscal year 2015, Proposition 1 will provide an estimated \$1.7 billion for TxDOT's use. Of that amount, the TxDOT Austin District, which is comprised of 11 counties including Bastrop, Blanco, Burnet, Caldwell, Gillespie, Hays, Lee, Llano, Mason, Travis and Williamson, expects to receive approximately \$120 million in funds. The rest of the money is going elsewhere in the state. While helpful, what the Austin District is receiving through Prop 1 is nowhere near close enough to cover the cost of building the proposed Oak Hill Parkway. Regarding the amount of roadway north of Williamson Creek, there is not enough room between the creek and the Oak Hill bluff to fit all the required roadways. See comment 64 regarding tolling. The height of the bridges has been minimized to the extent possible, using depressed roadways where necessary. While some heights are above 25 feet, they are only one level above the existing ground versus two levels

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
						in the 2007 alternatives. See comment 49 for the Joe Tanner Grove discussion.
69	Moran	Theresa	1/30/2015	Web Mail	Cannot make a decision on Alternative A or C without all of the information; need access to full schematic. No view of the access to Scenicbrook neighborhood. Does not know how this impacts ability to shop in the Y.	The access locations on US 290 and SH 71 for the Scenic Brook neighborhood are shown on the schematics. They are shown in PDF and Google Earth format on the project website at http://www.oakhillparkway.com/multimedia/index.php
70	York	Georgia	1/31/2015	Web Mail	Opposes A and C. Options do not meet the needs of the community. Listen to the community and Fix290 group. Build less expensive, un-tolled, safe, and environmentally friendly parkway that can be built and community can benefit from.	Concept F was developed with input from the Fix290 Coalition. Ultimately, Concept F was eliminated because it did not have a continuous frontage road system, which would have reduced mobility as well as an effective, reliable emergency route. Traffic projections show volume will exceed capacity in a few years and continuous flow lane improvements will not serve the long-term needs of the community.
71	Huggans	Renee	1/20/2015	Court Reporter	Alternative A is the only alternative for this area. As a Realtor who sells heavily in the Y area, clients will see the inconvenience of Alternative C and won't to want to look at homes in the area.	Comment noted.
72	Tobiansky	Robert	1/20/2015	Court Reporter	Serves as Aviara HOA president and involved with Oak Hill Association of Neighborhoods. Alternative A is much better solution because of access and improved property values. Concept C will be an issue for first responders and HEB access.	Comment noted.
73	Sanders	JC	1/20/2015	Court Reporter	As native Austinite who has seen Austin, Dripping Springs and surrounding area grow, excited about the two proposals. No strong opinion on either A or C, but wants improvement as quickly as possible.	Comment noted.
74	vanGoethem	Sandy	1/20/2015	Court Reporter	Traffic near Escarpment and Highway 45 is nearly unbearable. Alternative A most logical	Comment noted.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
					choice. Clarify Informational boards using lay terms. Concerned about 290/1826 intersection.	