
**Open House Summary
Comment and Response Report
For the Oak Hill Parkway
Open House held on June 17, 2014**



**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**

October 2014





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 Announcement
- Attachment C Additional Announcements
- Attachment D Workshop Meeting Notes
- Attachment E Open House Display Boards
- Attachment F Open House Handout Materials
- Attachment G Open House Photographs
- Attachment H Open House Sign-in Sheets
- Attachment I Virtual Open House Information
- Attachment J Continued Community Dialogue Materials
- Attachment K Written Comments
- Attachment L 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 June 17, 2014, 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 discuss the remaining and revised concepts; provide input on the evaluation criteria, discuss the Context Sensitive Solutions process and gather additional public input on the project.

The meeting was held from 4-7 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/S 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/S 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

Legal Notices and Advertisements

A legal notice for the Open House was published in the Austin American-Statesman on Saturday, June 7, 2014.

Color display advertisements were published in the Oak Hill Gazette on May 29, 2014, the Lake Travis View on June 5, 2014, the Community Impact Newspaper (Southwest Austin Edition) May 2014 issue and the Driftwood News Dispatch on June 5, 2014.

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

Email Announcements

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

- Email announcement #1 was sent on June 10, 2014 to 607 recipients
- Email announcement #2 was sent on June 17, 2014 to 826 recipients
- Email announcement #3 was sent on June 18, 2014 to 826 recipients

The Open House was also promoted in email newsletters:

- The Oak Hill Parkway email newsletter promoted the Open House and was distributed on June 10, 2014
- The city of Austin also promoted the Open House in their email newsletter, Austin Mobility go!, and was distributed on June 16, 2014

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 TxDOT and the Mobility Authority on June 10, 2014. The news release was also posted on the:

- TxDOT website (www.txdot.gov)
- Mobility Authority website (www.MobilityAuthority.com)
- Project website (www.OakHillParkway.com)
- City of Austin
- Project Twitter page (<https://twitter.com/OakHillParkway>).

Multiple Twitter announcements promoting the Open House were distributed by the Mobility Authority during the period of June 9-17, 2014.

Multiple Twitter announcements promoting the Virtual Open House and public involvement opportunities following the June 17 Open House were distributed by the Mobility Authority during the period of June 17-27, 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**.

The Open House was also promoted at an Oak Hill Parkway stakeholder workshop on May 27, 2014, held by TxDOT and the Mobility Authority. The workshop meeting allowed the community to review the latest proposal, referred to as Option 1, for extending the Oak Hill Parkway west of Circle Drive.

Notes from the Workshop Meeting are available in **Attachment D**.

In addition, a changeable message board was posted near the Covington Middle School at the intersection of Convict Hill Rd. and Brodie Lane. The sign flashed:

- OAK HILL PARKWAY OPN HOSE
- 3700 CONVICT HILL RD
- 6/17/14 4-7 PM

Photographs of the changeable message board are included in **Attachment G**.

Open House Date, Location, Format, Boards and Maps

The Open House was held Tuesday, June 17, 2014, in the Covington Middle School Cafeteria, 3700 Convict Hill Rd., Austin, Texas 78749. The meeting was held from 4-7 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 19 informational boards displayed for public viewing including information about screening criteria, the two build concepts selected to move forward, Context Sensitive



Solutions and other general information about the study. Schematic drawings of all eight concepts considered during the study (Concept A, Concept B, Concept C, Concept D, Concept E1, Concept E2, Concept F and 2007 Alternative) 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 Project Connect to provide information.

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

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
- Comment form
- Community Survey form
- Mobility Concepts list

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

Photographs of the open house are available in **Attachment G**.

Attendance

A total of 162 people signed in at the Open House, including 137 citizens from the general public, one elected official and 24 staff members.

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

Virtual Open House

The Virtual Open House on the project website (www.OakHillParkway.com) was available for public view June 18-27, 2014. 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 June 17 Open House attendees were notified of the Virtual Open House through the welcome letter handout.

The Virtual Open House recorded 346 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 I**.



Continued Community Dialogue

TxDOT and the Mobility Authority met with the Fix290 Coalition and neighborhood representatives on June 9, 2014 at the Oak Hill United Methodist Church to share information regarding concepts to be presented at the June 17, 2014 Open House meeting.

On Aug. 26, 2014, TxDOT and the Mobility Authority met with Fix290 Coalition and neighborhood representatives at the Oak Hill United Methodist Church to discuss and answer questions regarding the evaluation criteria and evaluation process presented at the Open house. A complete list of questions and responses from that meeting is available at: <http://www.oakhillparkway.com/news/files/stakeholder-questions.pdf>.

Meeting materials are available in **Attachment J**.

Public Comment Summary

The official public comment period for the June 17, 2014 Open House ran May 22-June 27, 2014. Members of the public could submit comments in person during the workshop meeting on May 27, 2014, and the open house on June 17, 2014. Various methods to provide input during the comment period included the following:

- Submitting a written comment form at the meetings
- Providing a verbal comment to the court reporter at the June 17 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 164 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 June 17, 2014
Open House Comment Period**

Submission Method	Total Comments
Written Comments (including comment forms and hand written comments)	88
Court Reporter Transcriptions	6
Webmail Submissions	70
Total Comments	164

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

Court Reporter transcript is included in **Attachment L**.

Comment and Response Report

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
1	Texans Against Tolls		6/27/2014	Comment Form	<p>FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.</p> <p>ATTACHMENT: State Comptroller's Report: Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority: A Need for a Higher Standard (March 2005).</p>	<p>SH 45SW is currently being studied to connect Loop 1 (MoPac) to FM 1626. The Capitol Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's (CAMPO) 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan does not connect SH 45SW to US 290; however, the cumulative effects of all transportation projects in the CAMPO 2035 will be considered in the Oak Hill Parkway EIS.</p> <p>Concepts selected to move forward will be based on their ability to meet the purpose and need of the project and additional screening criteria. An initial screening identified concepts simply meeting the Purpose and Need; the secondary screening identified concepts best meeting other measures such as reduced travel times, emergency response, and displacements. All concepts were screened at a comparable level of detail to avoid any bias towards a particular concept and projects costs were not used to rank the concepts at this stage as the numbers are very preliminary and will be refined in the future.</p> <p>Concepts A and C best met the Purpose and Need and additional screening criteria and were advanced along with the No-Build alternative. Concept F did not advance because of limited mobility and safety benefits compared to other alternatives and required increased commercial displacements.</p> <p>See oakhillparkway.com/news/files/stakeholder-questions.pdf for additional information.</p>

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
2	Akin	Kathy	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Supports Concept A because it addresses traffic flow in the Y and has continuous flow. Wants concept to maintain current easy access. Would like access to Buddy's Corner Store (Senor Buddy's) at 290 and Circle Dr. continued with a braided exit ramp at Circle Drive. Opposes Concept F.	Comment noted. We will continue to evaluate and refine the geometry of Concepts A and C to address access for all stakeholders. The current effort is working with local citizens to identify ways to improve long-term mobility in the region that respects social and environmental values in the Oak Hill community.
3	Anderson	Tommy	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads and is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No tolls.	See Response 1. 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 the CAMPO plan includes tolled express 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.
4	Anderson	T.H.	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.	See Response 1.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
5	Anderson	Mary	6/28/2014	Comment Form	<p>FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads.</p> <p>Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: Do another project study; no toll road.</p>	See Response 3.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
6	Anderson	Mary	6/27/2014	Comment Form	<p>Favors Concept F, does not want a freeway or tolled roads. Questions the legitimacy of the process because SH 45SW connection was not mentioned in the process. Demands a new study and disagrees with the evaluation matrix. States evaluation matrix is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Concept F best option for Edwards Aquifer.</p> <p>Questions cost estimations, don't match 2007 estimates and wants to know what wasn't included. Disagrees with Concept F travel time because 2 community fixes were not included in the model. Wants qualitative reason why Concept F failed Emergency Access evaluation.</p>	<p>See Response 1.</p> <p>The water quality evaluation will be performed at the next screening level of the detailed schematics for Concepts A and C. The use of Best Management Practices for temporary water quality treatment during construction and permanent water quality facilities would be employed under any of the build scenarios. TxDOT will adhere to TCEQ rules regarding construction of facilities within the Edwards Aquifer. Any of the build concepts evaluated thus far would have very similar impacts to water quality resulting in no discernable differences between the concepts.</p> <p>The 2007 estimates are seven years old and were made based on previous versions of the schematics. The 2014 cost estimates were based on the conceptual drawings prepared for this study and will be updated as more detail is developed for Concepts A and C.</p> <p>In regards to emergency access, a highway system without easy alternate routes, such as a parallel frontage road, will not perform well during an accident event on the highway.</p> <p>If main lanes are blocked by an accident, vehicles must use exit ramps prior to the accident. If these exits lead only to local streets and thoroughfares, they will not handle the overload of traffic as well as a parallel, continuous frontage road system will.</p>

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
7	Bain	Alan	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Supports Concept C, Likes reuse of existing roads, hopefully allowing easier construction and less impact on local traffic.	Comment noted.
8	Bastian	Theresa	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Concept C seems like a more effective, long term solution and provides local traffic more options.	Comment noted.
9	Bayer	Chad	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Concept A needs access to Old Bee Caves Road. No direct connectors from US 290 to SH 71. Worried about Williamson Creek flooding. Wants bike/ped access to Oak Hill shopping.	Both Concepts A and C will provide access to Old Bee Cave Road. Concepts A and C will also accommodate direct connectors for future improvements. These direct connectors may be constructed in phases for Concept A. We are working with the city of Austin and studying ways to decrease flooding along Williamson Creek. In addition, we will continue investigating the use of detention ponds to alleviate flooding concerns as a result of any construction. Bikeway and pedestrian use paths will be incorporated in the project. Now that the number of concepts moving forward has been refined, more bike/ped details can be developed in the schematics.
10	Bent	Win	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Prefers Concept A. Concept C adds too many paths and increases impervious cover.	Comment noted.
11	Boiko	Stephen	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Prefers Concept C because of uncertainty about flooding of Williamson Creek. Wants to know extent of soil analysis plans.	Geologic assessments will be performed including karst and recharge features and will be presented in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. See Response 9.
12	Bortto	Royce	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	Comment noted. See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
13	Boyt	Elizabeth	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Reexamine Concept F.	Comment noted. See Response 1.
14	Brown	Regina	6/24/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	Comment noted. See Response 2.
15	Burkcon	Larry	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Inadequate access to Old Bee Caves Road with Concept C. Also, there is a request to build an office building on Old Bee Caves at US 290. Concerned about potential flooding with Concept A.	Comment noted. Both Concepts A and C will provide access to Old Bee Cave Road. We will continue to evaluate and refine the geometry of these concepts to address access. See Response 9.
16	Burke	James	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
17	Burton	Bruce	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.	See Response 1.
18	Christian	Jim	6/25/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
19	Clark	Joline K.	6/24/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
20	Clark	Scott	6/24/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
21	Daniel	Dennis and Leslie	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Concepts A and C both good; marginally prefers A as it will be less visually invasive than C.	Comment noted.
22	Devonport	Glenna	6/24/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
23	Dickinson	Pam and Brandy	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: Demands new study, no tolls.	See Response 3.
24	Drozd	Ada and Sean	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Move forward with Concept A. Crucial to keep access to Old Bee Caves Road, for safety, access and livability of residents.	See Responses 2 and 9.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
25	Eliot	George	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No tolls.	See Response 3.
26	Epkin	Ruby	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
27	Fallon	Russell	6/24/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
28	Fesler	Lynn	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No tolls.	See Response 3.
29	Finan	Sally	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Re-evaluate Concept F. Concept A is unappealing. Concept C is second choice.	Comment noted. See Response 1.
30	Flint	Linda	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Reconsider Option 2. Resolve weak issues and move it forward.	Elements of Option 2 have been incorporated into the remaining concepts. We will continue to refine Concepts A and C throughout the process.
31	Fowler	Christine	6/17/2014	Comment Form	E2 or Concept F. No tolls.	E2 did not meet the purpose and need of the study. See Response 3.
32	Fowler	Ann	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Supports Concept F. Opposes tolls.	See Response 3.
33	Fremin	H	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Concerns about adequate drainage, retention of run off and noise from raised highway.	See Response 9. Detailed noise studies, including whether noise walls are warranted, will be analyzed in the EIS.
34	Frische	Anthony	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Likes Concept A and concrete path on the north side. Wants more bike paths separated from the road and a dirt path parallel to the road on the south side.	Comment noted. See Response 9.
35	Frische	Barbara	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Prefers Concept A as it offers better access in the Oak Hill-Convict Hill Road vicinity.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
36	Glazer	Stacey	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
37	Goodloe	Diana	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Both Concepts A and C seem viable; each has strengths.	Concepts A and C will continue to be refined.
38	Hardy	Doris	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Neither Concept A nor C offer continuous flow access eastbound from 290 to 71. The decrease from 3 lanes to 2 will create a bottle neck through the Y.	Refinements to Concepts A and C continue, including the consideration of additional lanes.
39	Harrell	Harris	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No tolls.	See Response 3.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
40	Henna	Steve	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.	See Response 1.
41	Hinshaw	James	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Wants HOV/HOT lane options as part of the design.	The next round of more detailed schematics for Concepts A and C will have an area in the median shown as a future transportation corridor.
42	Holder	Margaret	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No tolls, new study.	See Response 3.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
43	Howland	F.P.	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
44	Kroll	John	6/14/2014	Comment Form	Favors Option A for cost effectiveness and ability to accommodate future needs.	Comment noted.
45	Lake	Ralph	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Move Concept F forward since it is a collaboration between community members and the engineering team. Believes A and C are the most expensive and will separate the Central Business District and the residential district. The 19 minute vs. 11 minute travel time of Concepts A and C doesn't make sense.	See Responses 1 and 2. Concept F is the only concept with a 19 minute travel time. Concepts A and C had 11.5 and 11.9 minutes respectively. This is for the eastbound mainlanes of US 290 from Circle Drive to the vicinity of Old Fredericksburg Road in the morning peak hour, using the CAMPO projected 2035 traffic volumes. An inherent characteristic of Concept F is there are no continuous frontage roads. Therefore, more traffic utilizes the main lanes of US 290 causing more congestion and longer travel times.
46	Large	John	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Chooses Concept C. It's less invasive during construction and offers better options at ground level at the Y.	Comment noted.
47	Liverman	Janice	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.	See Response 1.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
48	Mach	Randall	6/27/2014	Comment Form	<p>FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.</p> <p>INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No toll road.</p>	See Response 3.
49	Malik	Dean	6/27/2014	Comment Form	<p>FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.</p> <p>INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No toll road.</p>	See Response 3.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
50	Mason	Steve	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No toll road.	See Response 3.
51	McCain	Richard	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Make sure Oak Hill Parkway has no tolls.	See Response 3.
52	McClure	Donald	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Prefers No-Build Alternative over a toll road.	Comment noted.
53	Mendoza	Federico	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Likes Concept C with two levels of direct connectors and CF1 concept at William Cannon. Suggests SH 71 segment in front of Jack Allen's be revised to a divided section with median openings every 300'.	See Response 2.
54	Neubauer	Elizabeth Reeder	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
55	Neubauer	Derrick	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
56	Noda	Elaine	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
57	Olson	Faith	6/25/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
58	Pruett	Darryl W.	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Prefers Concept A. Wants depressed lanes with bridges at grade or as low as possible.	See Response 2.
59	Rathod	Sanjay	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Prefers Concept A and C. Concept F should not be pursued; is bad for businesses and residents.	See Responses 1 and 2.
60	Rea	Chloe	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.	See Response 1.
61	Ritchie	Warren	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Build 2007 Alternative with Option 1	Comment noted.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
62	Richardson	Cassandra	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No tolls.	See Response 3.
63	Rogers	Dan	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Build Concept A or C. Reject no-build. Prefers A, but B ok.	See Response 2.
64	Rubottom	Angela T.	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Disappointed Concept F not moving forward but would like its features to be reflected in the end result. Questions why emergency vehicle routing cannot be accommodated more affordably. The concepts moving forward are the most expensive and look suspiciously designed for tolling. Appreciates environmental and aesthetic concepts are being considered.	See Response 3. One of the project team's goals is to develop a project that fits with the local setting and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic and environmental resources.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
65	Sanchez	Rudy and Marie	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No tolls.	See Response 3.
66	Schissler	James	6/17/2014	Comment Form	For Option C, although Option A would be less elevated, cheaper.	Comment noted.
67	Schultz	Bill	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Likes Concept A as it allows for a longer life. Against no-build option.	Comment noted.
68	Short	Lesley V.	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Supports Concept C and tolling as a financing mechanism	Comment noted.
69	Sperry	Karen	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Ensure adequate attention to detention/retention for potential Williamson Creek flooding. Concerned about noise from elevated freeways and is interested in sound control plans. Address the Joe Tanner/Old Fredericksburg Road intersection.	See Responses 9 and 33. Both remaining build alternatives, Concept A and C, treat these intersections similarly. Joe Tanner Lane will no longer be accessed through a signalized intersection from westbound US 290. It will "tee" into the eastbound US 290 frontage road with no signal. Old Fredericksburg Road will continue to have signalized intersections with the eastbound and westbound US 290 frontage roads.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
70	Staton	William R.	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Against continuous left turn lanes and the no-build alternative. What happened to the US 290 freeway extension in the 90's? Elevate US 290/SH 71 south of Williamson Creek to address flooding. Supports Concept A.	The continuous flow intersections lanes under construction will improve mobility and safety in the corridor while a longer term solution is determined. While the no-build concept does not meet the purpose and need of the project, federal environmental procedures require it to be considered. Construction bonds were not voted on or issued to pay for the US 290 freeway in Oak Hill. See Response 9. Comment noted.
71	Strange	Shirley	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Frustrated with the continuous studies of the Y and 290 at William Cannon. Wants progress.	Comment noted. An outdated 24-year-old environmental study, limited transportation funding and a lack of consensus on what to do have stymied transportation improvements in Oak Hill. Transportation officials are now working with local citizens and businesses to identify and improve long-range mobility in the region that respects social and environmental values of the Oak Hill Community.
72	Strange	Jerry	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Have studied William Cannon/US 290 for at least 20 years. Great-grandchildren will put a note on grave when project is figured out.	See Response 71.
73	Sullivan	Adam	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
74	Thompson	Staci	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
75	Tobiansky	Robert	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Supports Concept A because of safety and short driving distances for Oak Hill residents. Supports walk/bike trails parallel to Williamson Creek Bridge at Old Bee Caves Rd; creek needs to be widened and dredged.	See Response 9.
76	Tuley	John	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Favors Concept A. Concept C doesn't improve Old Bee Caves Road access.	See Response 2.
77	VanOlen	Kim	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No toll.	See Response 3.
78	Waddell	Mike	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive.	See Response 1.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
79	Walker	Cassandra	6/24/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
80	Walker	Jason	6/25/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
81	Ward	Brad	6/27/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: Process is corrupt because SH 45SW connection is not mentioned; demands new study. Also, two key community design concepts were not included in Concept F, which affected the evaluation criteria. Cost estimates in the evaluation matrix contain large discrepancies. It is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Toll roads push congestion to frontage roads. Wants Concept F because it has no continuous frontage roads, is less expensive. INDIVIDUAL COMMENT: No tolls.	See Response 3.
82	Weerakoon	Asanga	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Freescale prefers Concept A. Concept C encroaches on Freescale property and would disrupt manufacturing operations.	Comment noted. We will contact you to set up a meeting to discuss Freescale's concerns and needs.
83	Wittmeyer	Bob	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Wants no-build alternative. Suggests ramp at Scenic Brook and SH 71.	Comment noted. As we refine the geometry of Concepts A and C, we will consider your suggestion.
84	Wolter	Susan	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Very concerned about safety into/out of HEB shopping center, especially for making left turns. Keep left turn light to go westbound on US 290.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
85	Wukasch	Don C.	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Move drop off point of Concepts C and A further back to facilitate access to the Plaza 71 offices. The current versions raise safety concerns for right turns at high speeds.	See Response 2
86	Wukasch, II	Walter C.	6/24/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
87	Zavier	Breanna	6/26/2014	Comment Form	FORM LETTER: For Concept A and C requests 71 ramp moved south to facilitate access to 6807-7614 HWY 71-W and maintain safe entrance to building driveway.	See Response 2.
88	Zimmerman	Chessie	6/17/2014	Comment Form	Wants light and sound mitigation information on advancing concepts, especially for elevated sections. Clarify water quality/drainage assumptions since flood patterns have changed over the past decade.	See Responses 6 and 9.
89	Armitage	Angela	6/17/2014	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comment	Concept B should have a dedicated U-turn lane at SH 71 and Scenic Brook for southbound traffic. Concept A U-turn at Scenic Brook and SH 71 needs to be long enough to support cars turning left from HEB. Do a traffic study. Unsure of elevated lanes needlessly separating Oak Hill north and south.	See Response 2.
90	Boyt	Pat	6/17/2014	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comment	Supports a parkway, not a freeway	Comment noted.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
91	Hoang	Christine	6/17/2014	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comment	Supports Concept A, safer ingress and egress for community off Old Bee Caves Road. Against Concept F, no viable access to community and would be an issue for emergency response. Safety for Concept A could be improved with an immediate U-turn through Old Bee Caves and a traffic light in the area.	See Response 2.
92	Michalski	Allen	6/17/2014	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comment	Pleased with the project and data presented and wants a solution that addresses both ingress and egress and is environmentally sensitive. Supports Concept A and C, favors A overall. Would like to see improvement of traffic flow and improvements to green space, especially around Williamson Creek for water flow.	See Responses 2 and 9.
93	Rathod	Sanjay	6/17/2014	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comment	Opposed to F, supports Concept A and C because provide access to Old Bee Caves Road. Would like a review of traffic count on Old Bee Cave Road to make decision about access for US 290 and 71 both east and west.	See Response 2.
94	Tobiansky	Robert	6/17/2014	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comment	Concerned about access to Aviara and traffic on Old Bee Caves Road, and entrances/exits to 290 West and 71. Traffic/safety concern over possible 4-5 story building with 1.5 acre parking lot east of the Oak Hill Cemetery on Old Bee Caves. Community highly supportive of Concept A.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
95	Adcock	David	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Supports Concept F. Believes the decision matrix was biased against a parkway option. Concerns for travel time and safety could have been remedied by design changes. Concept F is the low cost option. Emergency access considerations biased towards A and C, even though have fewer access points than F. Very skeptical of price projections. ACC Pinnacle and Oak Hill United Methodist access not evaluated. Wants fair criteria and evaluation for Concept F.	See Response 1.
96	Alford	David	6/18/2014	Web Mail	Prefers Concept A with depressed lanes	Comment noted.
97	Anderson	Mary	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Favors Concept F, wants new study because of SH 45SW. Evaluation matrix biased and subjective because of reliance on continuous frontage roads. Emergency Access evaluation subjective. Concerned about ACC access and future tolling. Contests traffic counts and study, wants a new one conducted	See Response 1.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
98	Backus	Andrew	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Favors concept F, does not want a freeway or tolled roads. Questions the legitimacy of the process because SH 45SW connection was not mentioned in the process. Demands a new study and disagrees with the evaluation matrix. States evaluation matrix is biased and favors concepts with frontage roads that do not resemble a parkway. Questions cost estimations, don't match 2007 estimates and wants to know what wasn't included. Disagrees with Concept F travel time because 2 community fixes were not included in the model. Requests quantitative reasoning for F's failure of emergency access. Demands local traffic count promised by CTRMA/TxDOT/CAMPO. Wants a depressed William Cannon considered.	See Response 1.
99	Batchelor	Jeffery	6/27/2014	Web Mail	My preference is to keep the area looking like a neighborhood setup and community. Overhead expressways make the area look too urban.	See Response 2.
100	Beeler	Scott	6/19/2014	Web Mail	Build A or C, improvements are 15-20 years overdue. Southwest Austin and Travis county residents tired of improvements being delayed, there are no excuses. Finalize plans and funding now. Environmental impact and quality of life is horrible due to idling traffic. Aggravated about the process's length and that build out is years away. It shouldn't take this long to build a road.	See Responses 2 and 71.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
101	Beers	Steve	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Concept F biasedly dismissed. Fix290 was most aligned with CAMPO definition of parkway and was without tolls. Don't need frontage roads. Save the land west of Joe Tanner and don't damage 200 year trees, creek, or aquifer. Noise and visual intrusions should be included on matrix. 10-day comment period poorly managed. No distinction between tolled and non-ttolled model times, frontage roads fail if tolled - per CAMPO 2030. Skeptical of cost estimates, no estimates for drainage or water control. CTRMA not an object evaluator based on funding sources. One, explicitly non-ttolled, non-elevated parkway without frontage roads between 290 and Joe Tanner should be advanced.	See Response 1.
102	Beers	Steve	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Concept F basically dismissed. Fix290 was most aligned with CAMPO definition of parkway and was without tolls. Don't need frontage roads. Save the land west of Joe Tanner and don't damage 200 year trees, creek, or aquifer. Noise and visual intrusions should be included in the matrix. CTRMA not an objective party based on funding sources. Concept F's modeling missing two design changes. One non-ttolled, non-elevated parkway without frontage roads between Joe Tanner and 290 should be evaluated.	See Response 1.
103	Benthall	Mark	6/19/2014	Web Mail	Opposed to existing roads in Oak Hill converted into toll roads. Supports non-ttolled option.	See Response 3.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
104	Berger	Travis	6/16/2014	Web Mail	Flow at the 290/71 interchange is managed horribly, light timing during peak hours, not the "Y", are the cause of the backups. Synchronize the lights to move most volume on and off the corridor and freeway to remove the choke point. System designed poorly, cannot handle school year vehicle loads and needs to be monitored (ITS). East bound from Y is backed up at William Cannon light, same issue on west side by ACC and Red's Gun Range. Install a system that can monitor the flow issue. It shouldn't cost millions of dollars to do.	Comment noted. US 290 is one of Texas' most congested highway corridors with drivers wasting more than 340,000 hours per year stuck in traffic. Congestion has reduced mobility and the quality of life in Oak Hill and surrounding communities. TxDOT will continue to evaluate signal timing as interim intersection improvements are completed.
105	Bomer	Crystal	6/17/2014	Web Mail	Decision matrix is too subjective. Skeptical of cost projects because different from the 2007 projections. Matrix is statistically biased because 40% of decision criteria based on continuous frontage roads. Design interventions to improve travel time for Concept F was not included in time evaluation. No quantitative reason for Concept F's failure of Emergency Access, Concept F has better access than other Concepts - 18 exits. Need evaluation of detour route travel time and households impacted.	See Response 1.
106	Borrello	John	6/16/2014	Web Mail	Wants a fair comparison of Concept F, other concepts not appropriate for neighborhood. Untolled or tolled parkway preferred choice.	See Response 1.
107	Bowman	David	6/25/2014	Web Mail	My preference is Concept A.	Comment noted.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
108	Burklow	Ceci	6/18/2014	Web Mail	Prefers Concept A, member of the Aviara community. Concerned about low water crossing on Old Bee Caves Road and access to MoPac/Austin if other concepts are pursued.	See Responses 2 and 9.
109	Calvert	Lindsay	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Very disappointed that the Concept F design fixes were not included in the evaluation process.	See Response 1.
110	Casarz	Linda	6/19/2014	Web Mail	Strongly favors Concept A, best for the Aviara neighborhood access to 290/71 from Old Bee Caves.	See Response 2.
111	Cespedes	Carol	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Wants consideration of depressed lanes at William Cannon and further explanation of Concept F's rejection. Evaluation did not include Concept F's latest alternative suggestions from the community - bring 71 eastbound traffic in from the right and facilitate faster travel time. Several matrix criteria did not apply to Concept F and doesn't take into account the 18 access ramps.	See Response 1.
112	Davis	Walter	6/16/2014	Web Mail	Decision matrix is very biased to automatically disqualify Concept F and only choices available are tolled roads. Matrix designed to arrive at a predetermined choice because of CTRMA's involvement. Open house is just a "feel good" exercise and example of government not listening.	See Response 1.
113	Dossey	Pat	6/17/2014	Web Mail	Opposed to tolls - in Oak Hill and throughout Texas.	See Response 3.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
114	Dunn	Cliff	6/17/2014	Web Mail	Wants to know where the flyover at US 290 is from the bonds issued 20 years ago. Believes that money went towards US 183. Demands fly over be built now and stopgap measures cease. Believes the city and state has disregarded Oak Hill's needs for years.	Construction bonds were not voted on or issued to pay for the US 290 freeway in Oak Hill. An outdated 24-year-old environmental study, limited transportation funding and a lack of consensus on what to do have stymied transportation improvements in Oak Hill. Transportation officials are now working with local citizens and businesses to identify and improve long-range mobility in the region that respects social and environmental values of the Oak Hill community.
115	Fossum	Michael	6/27/2014	Web Mail	The Austin Heritage Tree foundation wants as many trees as possible preserved with minimal or tolerable impacts from construction and use, especially the protected and heritage trees. Specifically addresses Old Bee Caves, Mother Oak, three Freescale entrance trees, trees at Joe Tanner median, and tree southwest of Taco Bell. Opposes Concept A, which requires removal of many trees; favors Concept C. Suggests shared path be located by Beckett Grove and it become a green open space. Preserve/transplant Mother Oak.	Refinements to Concepts A and C continue, including the consideration of minimizing impact to trees along the projected route. Now that the number of concepts moving forward has been refined, more bicyclist/pedestrian details can be developed in the schematics.
116	Gaylord	Monica	5/23/2014	Web Mail	Add a light at Patton School Road for residents to turn around, will help alleviate traffic on William Cannon.	Comment noted.
117	Glendenning	Marilyn Jones	6/14/2014	Web Mail	Decision matrix biased against Concept F because of continuous frontage roads. Provide a more balanced and fair matrix.	See Response 1.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
118	Gray	Kevin	6/27/2014	Web Mail	<p>Wants Open House schedule extended to 8 p.m. Favors Concept F, because of the parkway segment between the Y and William Cannon. Convinced it was rejected based on funding mechanisms, not design merits. Using Mobility Authorities distorts the purpose of road projects, makes it about maximizing toll bond values, not reducing congestion. Tolling main lanes will increase congestion on frontage roads. Get tolling out of the process and can create a true parkway to handle local and through traffic.</p>	See Responses 1 and 3.
119	Halpin	Beki	6/23/2014	Web Mail	<p>Evaluation process biased against Concept F because it couldn't be measured on frontage roads and other concepts were. Concept F had a different design than what was presented, why was this not implemented in the final design? Explain Concept F's emergency access failure. Other concepts should be rated as tolled facility before any concepts are eliminated. Concept F costs much less, if A or C are built as a toll road, the access road will fail.</p>	See Response 1.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
120	Halpin	Beki	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Traffic projections grossly overestimated, current traffic levels drastically below CAMPO 2035 plan. Overestimation means a project built much larger and sooner than necessary. Concept A and C frontage roads will fail, Concept F doesn't have possibility of frontage road failure. Tolted project will fail more quickly, issue of ingress and egress for emergency vehicles. It is deceptive that A and C are rated as free road, but will likely be tolled. Freescale opposes A and C because highway vibration on its property is bad for manufacturing. Favors Concept F, as does the community - most like a parkway, least expensive.	Traffic along US 290 between William Cannon Drive and SH 71 has grown from 19,090 vehicles per day in 1980 to 57,000 vehicles per day in 2011 (an average 6.5 percent growth). The CAMPO 2035 projected traffic volume is 84,000 vehicles per day (an average 1.6 percent growth). See Responses 1 and 3. We will continue to meet and work with Freescale throughout this process.
121	Hall	Terri	6/17/2014	Web Mail	Expand highways without tolls. Free lanes give access to every commuter and handles more traffic than toll lanes. Tolls will displace traffic to free lanes and side roads making congestion permanent. Add adequate capacity, get the corridor moving again.	Comment noted. See Response 3.
122	Hoang	Christine	6/11/2014	Web Mail	Concept F is bad, jeopardizes health and safety of residents in Aviara community. Community will be cut off, and those on Old Bee Caves will have to use Fletcher to access 290 or Weir Hills to access William Cannon. Both options are unsafe.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
123	Hoang	Christine	6/11/2014	Web Mail	Concept F is bad, jeopardizes health and safety of residents in Aviara community. Community will be cut off, and those on Old Bee Caves will have to use Fletcher to access 290 or Weir Hills to access William Cannon. Both options are unsafe. Explore installing a protected light at Old Bee Caves and 290/71.	See Response 2.
124	Hollenbeck	Richard	6/18/2014	Web Mail	Want bicycle improvement information on concepts. Is for the concept that most supports safe, efficient bicycle travel in the region. Wants separated, paved pathway along 290 and 71 with access to businesses, driveways and streets. Supports maximum 45 mph speed limit on frontage roads.	Bicyclist and pedestrian use paths will be incorporated in the project. Now that the number of concepts moving forward has been refined, more bicyclist/pedestrian details can be developed in the schematics.
125	Joyce	Dennis	6/17/2014	Web Mail	Against turning current highways into tolls, they go to foreigners. Residents pay for maintenance and use of our own property. Will try to remove from office and employment supporters of tolls.	Comment noted. See Response 3.
126	Kelly	Ryan	6/26/2014	Web Mail	Strongly supports Concept A. Need a true highway interchange with access roads for Oak Hill. Less would not effectively move traffic. Is necessary to provide easier access to area businesses and restaurants; this could be the next Arboretum.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
127	Kelly	Stephanie	6/10/2014	Web Mail	Opposes Concept F, it would cut off Aviara's access to Old Bee Caves. Proposes any plan that maintains access to 71 from Old Bee Caves. Fletcher, Weir Hills, and Southwest Parkway. Weir Hills is very dangerous and needs repair and expansion. Concept F increases commute time and makes property values suffer.	See Response 2.
128	Kennedy	Suzanne	6/23/2014	Web Mail	Proposed plans will make entering Studio E on Hwy 71 extremely dangerous. Reconsider plans with local businesses in mind.	See Response 2.
129	Koeninger	Patty	6/17/2014	Web Mail	Prefers Concept F, less expensive, less invasive, will not be tolled.	See Response 1.
130	Lake	Ralph	6/26/2014	Web Mail	Supports Concept F. Modify presentation of Concept F - include design changes that reduce travel time and make more comparable to A and C. Decision matrix is interesting, but concerning Concept A and C display similar design characteristics from previous efforts that failed. A and C divide central business district and residents of Oak Hill. Put more effort into Concept F that community and staff designed, find a creative solution for travel time and hospital access. Carry Concept F forward.	See Response 1.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
131	Lake	Ralph	6/26/2014	Web Mail	Decision to carry forward Concept A and C is significantly flawed, presenters could not explain the decisions made based on the matrix. No effort to resolve the 2 main issues with Concept F, developed by TxDOT engineers with community input. Carry Concept F forward and creatively solve the bottle neck and emergency access concerns. Community desires ignored. Matrix biased towards toll friendly alternatives, despite their higher costs. A and C offer limited access to neighborhoods surrounding the Y and create a physical barrier for residents and businesses. Wall in Concept C will cause flooding up creek.	See Responses 1, 2 and 9.
132	Lazarus	Joan	6/2/2014	Web Mail	Support Concept F, best plan to prevent Williamson Creek flooding. Impact on Williamson Creek is major concern to those living in Westcreek. Thoughtfully consider impact of project on creek.	See Responses 1 and 9.
133	Lemery	Monya	6/19/2014	Web Mail	I am in support of concept A. I live in Aviara off Old Bee Cave Road and would like access to 290 and 71 east and westbound.	See Response 2.
134	Litch	Tim	6/17/2014	Web Mail	Removal of the rock wall north of 290 and west of 71 was extreme and saddening. Please maintain more nature when roadways are constructed. Come up with a more aesthetic and economical goal instead of paving slopes and adding to run-off problems and causing heat to sink. It's ugly.	Comment noted. Our team will look for opportunities to incorporate more natural cuts and slopes where possible.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
135	Luna	Pat	6/19/2014	Web Mail	Already hear trucks and heavy traffic off US 290 and Convict Hill. Don't build bridges and overpasses, this will increase noise levels for the houses and apartments along the road. Support a peaceful, attractive parkway that encourages businesses and restaurants to move to the area and doesn't ruin the environment. Please design similarly to Hill Country Galleria area.	Comment noted. We are maximizing the use of depressed design concepts to reduce the need for bridges and overpasses.
136	MacCauley	David	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Displeased with concept evaluation stage. Community is in favor of a parkway, not a freeway. Decision matrix biased, created to exclude a parkway and advance A and C. Process designed to make community feel like they had input, but pursue TxDOT's goals regardless of community's feelings. None of the suggested community designs will move forward. Sick of concrete bridges through downtown Oak Hill in A and C. No recourse to address lack of aesthetic choices moving forward because TxDOT has political protection from appearing to engage the community. Do not toll if Concept A or C move forward, would prefer a no-build over A or C.	See Response 1. While a wide range of design concepts were considered, two concepts with frontage roads (A and C) were identified to best meet the project's Purpose and Need and were advanced along with the No-Build alternative. A concept without frontage roads was not advanced because it had limited mobility and safety benefits and required increased commercial displacements. A Context Sensitive Solutions process will help in developing design components to reflect the community's vision for the project. A Context Sensitive Solutions Advisory Committee will be formed to include members from neighborhoods along the corridor. Major project design components will be conceptualized with input from the committee including bridges; retaining walls and possible sound walls; along with landscape treatments; hardscapes; and possibly signature design elements to unify the look and feel of the corridor. The general public will also be able to share their design opinions during the environmental study process.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
137	Manning	Brian	6/19/2014	Web Mail	Supports Concept A, best serves personal needs. Provides good access to Old Bee Caves and Aviara. Allows free flow of traffic west on 71 and 290, without unnecessary intersections and signals. Plan ahead for revitalization at the intersections. Footprint is manageable with minimal environmental impact.	See Response 2.
138	Melton	Bruce	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Demands new study based on SH 45SW potential connection to 290, questions legitimacy. Decision matrix biased, 4 categories do not apply to Concept F because doesn't have frontage roads. Two community design concepts not included in final design or evaluation. No access to main lanes from Scenic brook and 71 in A and C. No explanation for why F failed utility or emergency access criteria. No noise analysis conducted for elevated Joe Tanner. Concept C creates blight. Freescale won't support A or C, intrudes onto property. Access to ACC not properly evaluated. CAMPO 2030 and 2035 traffic counts overestimated. CTRMA's involvement is a conflict of interest. Still awaiting promised traffic counts on local roads.	See Responses 1, 2 and 120.
139	Mirale	Dina	5/22/2014	Web Mail	Place a light at Patton school and access road, safe for residents and families exiting east on Oak Hill Elementary on 290.	See Response 2.
140	Monsees	Eve	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Supports Concept F, best option for residents and commuters. It is the best for environmental and noise issues too. Wants views of resident taken into account.	See Responses 1 and 6.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
141	Monsees	Richard	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Support Concept F, least invasive. Would be upset if have to pay toll to visit neighborhood businesses.	See Responses 1 and 3.
142	Monsees	Susan	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Support Concept F, noise level and bright light from other concepts are a serious concern. Tolling unnecessary, will cause neighborhood cut through. Concept F is least expensive, less environmental impact.	See Responses 1 and 6.
143	Mosrie	David	6/19/2014	Web Mail	Fully support Concept A, wants direct access to home inside the Y	See Response 2.
144	Pasloske	Brittan	6/19/2014	Web Mail	Supports Concept A. Consider a westbound off-ramp to simplify access to South View Road and Circle Drive.	See Response 2.
145	Puchert	J	6/26/2014	Web Mail	Good job developing and evaluation the concepts. Strongly support full-fledged freeway with continuous frontage roads and direct-connectors. Strongly support Concept A, will withstand test of time.	See Response 2.
146	Riantono	Ronald	6/11/2014	Web Mail	Opposes Concept F, will jeopardize health and safety of residents in Aviara. Concept F will cut off access to 290/71 to community and residents on Old Bee Caves. Will have to use unsafe roads: Fletcher to reach 290, Weir Hills for William Cannon. Explore option to allow safe access to and from Old Bee Caves and 290/71.	See Response 2.
147	Richardson	David	6/20/2014	Web Mail	Break PDFs into sections for different schematics. Zoomed in map is blurry, impossible to see detail. Thank you for last work session, feels team addressed community needs.	KMZ files of the concepts have been added for use with Google Earth.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
148	Rohrer	Mary	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Please contact to discuss HEB's concerns regarding Concept A and C. Include off ramp for westbound 290/71 travelers to access existing HEB. Maintain left turn signal at McDonalds into HEB center. Requests frontage road system and ramps designed so HEB property at RM1826 and US 290 can be accessed.	See Response 2. A meeting with HEB has been arranged.
149	Rumelt	Andrew	6/17/2014	Web Mail	No Tolls at the Y in Oak Hill. Build a parkway instead.	See Response 3.
150	Scruggs	Edward	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Not much difference between A and C. Prefer Concept with least impact on the creek and would allow room for light recreation or a park. Prefer Concept F remain under consideration or elements be incorporated. Concerned about how residents at Scenic Brook and Windmill Run will access neighborhood, undue burden on these residents.	See Responses 1 and 2.
151	Seale	Lisa	5/22/2014	Web Mail	Concerned about neighborhood access, Southwest Parkway is not appropriate due to terrible morning traffic. Would like a turnaround coming out of Oak Park neighborhood, many residents and Oak Hill Elementary is there.	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
152	Simanton	Gary	6/18/2014	Web Mail	Option A looks the least intrusive, as long as you aren't planning on screwing us all with a toll road. What exactly is being built right now? Lots of construction between the end of the freeway and RM 1826. If this is the "no build" plan, can you provide a clearer PDF?	See Responses 2 and 3. US 290 intersections in the Oak Hill area have seen tremendous traffic growth leading to heavy congestion. TxDOT, in cooperation with the City of Austin and Travis County, is performing improvements at five intersections along US 290 in western Travis County. These improvement projects will, in the short-term, reduce congestion, improve mobility and enhance safety at area intersections by providing more streamlined intersections, a center turn lane, and dedicated left-turn lanes. The US 290 intersection improvements will provide an interim solution to congestion while the environmental study is underway and until a long-term solution can be implemented.
153	Sosa	Lupe	6/23/2014	Web Mail	Improve safety for YMCA at Oakclaire and Hwy 71, to go northbound must cross three lanes of heavy traffic - it is very dangerous. No alternative routes in the neighborhood behind the YMCA.	See Response 2.
154	Staton	William	6/2/2014	Web Mail	How are stakeholders notified, only found out through newspapers not through HOA of those traveling 290 daily. Continuous left turns are a waste of time and will be ineffective upon completion. Worried about depressed lanes flooding and creek beds need to be cleared out up to Colorado River. Upset about the omission of the bond initiative in the 1990s for 290. Should have added two lanes to Williamson Creek bridge. Wants to know why TxDOT isn't getting enough funding from gas tax, because more is being purchased.	Notice of the Oak Hill Parkway's open house was promoted in a variety of ways including display newspaper advertisements; legal notice; emails; e-newsletters; announcements to local-area news media; posts on multiple websites; Twitter messages and a changeable message board. See Responses 9, 70 and 152. According to the Texas A&M Transportation Institute, "while fuel costs have tripled, the gas tax — the primary way we pay for our roads — has stayed the same (since 1991). Because of inflation, we have less and less money available to pay for roads and bridges."

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
155	Staton	William	6/19/2014	Web Mail	<p>Continuous left turns at 290 and William Cannon are waste of money. Conflict is eastbound traffic in center lane that turns left at 290 and 71. Define end of left turn lane with concrete structure. If A or C are built, include other options presented.</p> <p>Hike and bike trail is a waste of money, build it at grade if can justify spending the money. No build is a waste of time, need changes. Concern for depressed lanes flooding and creek beds need to be cleared out up to Colorado River. Upset about the omission of the bond initiative in the 1990s for 290. Should have added two lanes to Williamson Creek Bridge.</p> <p>Wants to know why TxDOT isn't getting enough funding from gas tax, because more is being purchased.</p>	See Response 154.
156	Street	Andrea	6/20/2014	Web Mail	<p>Supports Concept F, upset at its dismissal. Wanted a cooperative design produced from TxDOT/CTRMA/Community working together. Selected concepts do not resemble the parkway of the project's namesake. Disqualified the cheaper concept, and pursued those conducive to tolling. Please preserve the natural beauty. No over passes, incorporate hike and bike trails by Williamson Creek.</p> <p>Leave heritage trees. Move Concept F forward.</p>	See Response 1.
157	Tang	Rachel	6/17/2014	Web Mail	<p>Closing access to 71/290 from Old Bee Caves would significantly and negatively impact commute time and home value.</p> <p>Explore other options to address congestion.</p>	See Response 2.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
158	Thayer	Thomas	6/18/2014	Web Mail	Should not consider costs prior to conducting detailed EIS. Decision matrix created to eliminate cheapest and most environmentally sensitive. Matrix narrowed design prior to EIS. Explain why cost projects are different now. Biases towards frontage roads, which Concept F doesn't have. Emergency access criteria subjective. Depress William Cannon with pumps. Preserve businesses. EIS should fairly study the concepts.	See Response 1.
159	Tijerina	Johnny	6/10/2014	Web Mail	Remove Concept F from consideration, it removes emergency access to Aviara community and closes Old Bee Caves.	See Response 2.
160	Tompkins	Tania	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Supports Concept C, retains more of Oak Hill charm. Would a parkway concept with freeway accessibility be an option? Need more pedestrian options near Granada Hills, how would one access shared use path on other side of RM1826? Also support no-build, but with many walkway added throughout the Y and 290 to safely cross 290.	The remaining build concepts, Concepts A and C, are freeway and frontage road systems and are being carried forward for refinement and study as they best met the purpose and need for the project. A parkway concept was one of the concepts considered, but it did not advance since it provided only limited mobility and safety improvements, and increased displacements. Regarding pedestrian access, sidewalks will be provided along frontage roads where there are not shared use paths. There will be a signalized intersection of RM 1826 and the US 290 frontage roads with pedestrian cross walks that would provide access to the shared use path. Regarding your support of the no-build, comment noted, but the no-build alternative does not include construction of any pedestrian facilities.

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
161	Vega	Zoila	6/27/2014	Web Mail	Support Concept C to save trees. Save or transplant more iconic trees. Ensure preserved, protected and heritage trees can survive. Save tree at Joe Tanner intersection. Include transplanting trees in budget. Stay away from the creek to protect wildlife, trees and creek. Move shared path north south along 290 for access to Taco Bell tree. Opposed to Concept A it will remove Mother Oak, and Freescale entrance trees. Preserve or transplant these.	See Response 115.
162	Vuris	John	6/18/2014	Web Mail	1) How many vehicles will it let travel from 7 am to 7 pm? 2) Where will I have to go from Oak Park to travel east on US 290?	The current CAMPO travel demand model does not have 12-hour projects, only 24 hour. The 2035 projected volume along US 290 between SH 71 and William Cannon Drive is 118,000 vehicles per day. Travel from the Oak Park neighborhood to eastbound US 290: Concept A - use the U-turn just east of William Cannon Drive; Concept C - use the U-turn currently being constructed just east of Joe Tanner Lane.
163	Weylie	Laura	6/21/2014	Web Mail	I will be happy with any plan as long as it is NOT a toll. I avoid tolls in North Austin and do not want to avoid them in my own neighborhood. I pay plenty of taxes and will not pay for the user base tax from a toll road.	See Response 3.
164	Windham	Debra	6/18/2014	Web Mail	Supports Concept F. Against tolls, especially because cut-through traffic in the neighborhoods is the biggest concern for me. I think Option F is the most financially and environmentally responsible as well.	See Response 1.