
**Open House Summary
Comment and Response Report
for the Oak Hill Parkway
Open House held on May 23, 2013**



**OAK HILL
PARKWAY**

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
Travis County, Texas

**Prepared for
Federal Highway Administration and
Texas Department of Transportation
August 2013**





OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY

Table of Contents

Open House Meeting Report.....	1
Comment and Response Report	5

List of Attachments

- Attachment A Advertisement of Open House
- Attachment B E-Newsletter "Public Shaping Vision for the Oak Hill Parkway"
- Attachment C Notes - Design Concept Preview Meeting
- Attachment D Open House Display Boards
- Attachment E Open House Handout Materials
- Attachment F Open House Photos
- Attachment G Completed Design Concept Surveys
- Attachment H Open House Registration Sheets
- Attachment I Comment Forms
- Attachment J Court Reporter Comment Transcript



Open House Summary

An Open House was held by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority (Mobility Authority) on May 23, 2013 to gather input regarding the Oak Hill Parkway Study, U.S. Highway (US) 290/State Highway (SH) 71 West in Oak Hill. The meeting was held specifically to review information provided by the public at the Oak Hill Parkway scoping meeting on November 15, 2012 and subsequent workgroup meetings, discuss alternative concepts being developed based on public input, and gather additional public input on the project. The meeting was held from 6 to 8 p.m. on May 23, 2013 in the Clint Small, Jr. Middle School Gymnasium, 4801 Monterey Oaks Boulevard, Austin, Texas. The meeting utilized 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.

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; and
- Improve emergency response.

The needs for the proposed improvements are:

- Traffic congestion related to population growth;
- Over 300 collisions were reported within the project limits between 2009 and 2011 resulting in nine incapacitating injuries and one fatality;
- Lost time stuck in traffic;
- Lack of connectivity; and
- 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, improves mobility, and adds value to the Oak Hill community and the surrounding area;
- Promotes sustainable growth by incorporating elements from the Green Mobility Challenge;
- Is consistent with and supports community goals for the enhancement of Oak Hill; and
- Moves more people safely and reliably, not just more vehicles.

Open House Information

Legal Notices and Advertisements

Legal notices for the Open House were published in the Austin American-Statesman on Tuesday, April 23, 2013 and Monday, May 13, 2013.

Color display advertisements were published in the Oak Hill Gazette on May 2 and May 16, 2013, the Lake Travis View on May 9, 2013, the Driftwood News Dispatch on May 16, 2013 and the May 2013 issue of Community Impact (Southwest Austin Edition).

Copies of the legal notices, display ad, tearsheets and affidavits are included in **Attachment A**.

e-Newsletter

An e-newsletter announcing the Open House and summarizing previous outreach meetings and input was distributed to 159 individuals and groups that requested being added to the study database.

A copy of the e-newsletter is 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 May 21, 2013. The news release was also posted on the TxDOT website (www.txdot.gov), the Mobility Authority website (www.MobilityAuthority.com), the project website (www.OakHillParkway.com), and in Twitter feeds (<https://twitter.com/OakHillParkway>).

A news release promoting continued opportunity for public involvement through a Virtual Open House was distributed to Austin area news media by the Mobility Authority and TxDOT on May 24. The news release was also posted on the Mobility Authority website (www.MobilityAuthority.com).



The Open House was also promoted at a May 16, 2013 Oak Hill Parkway Design Concept Preview Meeting held by TxDOT and the Mobility Authority. The preview meeting was held to allow the community to preview and give feedback on preliminary design concepts developed for the project based on public input received to date. Notes from the Design Concept Preview Meeting are available in **Attachment C**.

Open House Date, Location, and Format

The Open House was held Thursday, May 23, 2013 in the Clint Small, Jr. Middle School Gymnasium, 4801 Monterey Oaks Boulevard, Austin, Texas. The meeting was held from 6 to 8 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.

Twenty-one informational boards were displayed around the room for public viewing. The boards included information on the project's Purpose and Need statement, the environmental process, project schedule, the Green Mobility Challenge, eight preliminary design concepts, one option to extend the west transition past Circle Drive, a summary of public involvement opportunities to date, the Oak Hill Parkway virtual open house, and survey results from the November 15, 2012 Open House meeting.

Maps showing eight preliminary design concepts and one option to extend the west transition were displayed for the public to view. In addition, a map provided by the Oak Hill Trails Association showing planned and potential trails for the area was displayed. A map of potential environmental constraints within the study area was also provided for public viewing.

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, a station was set up to provide attendees information regarding intersection improvement projects in the corridor.

Tables were arranged in the middle of the room so attendees could have a place to fill out comment forms and surveys. Two boxes were available near the door and near the informational boards for attendees to leave their completed comment cards and survey forms. A court reporter was also available to transcribe comments from attendees who desired to give their input verbally.

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

Registration and Handouts

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

- Welcome letter from TxDOT and the Mobility Authority;
- Comment form;
- Concept list;



- Design Concepts Survey; and
- Information about the Virtual Open House.

The open house handout materials are available in **Attachment E**.
Photographs of the open house are available in **Attachment F**.
Completed Design Concepts Surveys are available in **Attachment G**.

Attendance

Seventy-eight people signed in from the general public at the Open House. Sign-in sheets for the Open House Meeting are included as **Attachment H**.

Public Comment Summary

During the Open House, attendees were invited to review information provided by the public at the Oak Hill Parkway scoping meeting held on November 15, 2012 and at subsequent workgroup meetings, discuss preliminary design concepts being developed based on the public input received, and to submit additional comments on the project.

Attendees had the option of leaving their completed comment forms in drop boxes provided at the meeting, verbalizing their comments to a court reporter at the meeting or mailing/emailing their comments within a ten-day comment period. The deadline to receive written comments was Monday, June 3, 2013.

Written comments were accepted if they were mailed to the TxDOT Austin District Environmental Coordinator, Texas Department of Transportation, P.O. Drawer 15426, Austin, Texas, 78761-5426, faxed to 512-832-7157, or submitted on the project Website (www.OakHillParkway.com) and received during the official comment period from Tuesday, April 23, 2013 to Monday, June 3, 2013 at midnight.

Fifty-nine comments were received during the official comment period. A summary of the comments received and a response to the comment follows in the Comment and Response Report.

Comment forms and surveys are available as **Attachment I**.
Court Reporter transcripts are included in **Attachment J**.



Comment and Response Report

Fifty-nine comments were received during the official comment period. A summary of the comments received and the response provided is contained in the following table.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
1	Armitage	Richard	5/23/2012	Comment Form	"I liked Concept C. The William Cannon Concept looks interesting if concept C is too expensive."	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
2	Bogt	Pat	5/23/2013	Comment Form	"C' is the best offered but very expensive."	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
3	Gray	Robert	5/23/2013	Comment Form	"Concept A - I feel it has the best and safest traffic flow."	Comment noted.
4	Hanson	Reed	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Likes how the issues were addressed in Concept A-D, not E1 or E2. Does not want toll roads and wants connectors at "the three main places needed".	Comment noted. Multiple alternatives are being evaluated, including Non-Toll and No-Build options. However, because transportation funding is limited and the CAMPO Plan includes Toll Roads and Toll Express Lanes, tolling some element of the Build Alternatives will likely be considered. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. We are developing a new concept based on input from Fix290. Improving mobility is a key purpose of the project study. The need for possible improvements is due to congestion related to population growth in the area, crashes, lost time stuck in traffic, lack of connectivity in the area and unreliable route for transit and emergency vehicles.
5	Hartwell	Andrew	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Says Concepts A-D would all be genuine solutions and wants something done soon. Says A is ideal D is almost as good, does not want tolls. Says B and C would be worse for local traffic than A or D.	Comment noted. Improving mobility is a key purpose of the project study. See Response 4.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
6	J	Andy	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Says a key is direct connectors. Likes C, then A. Concerned for the creek's survival and wants a good riparian corridor maintained. Wants to see green infrastructure and was thankful for the event.	A number of innovative concepts and ideas will be considered as part of the environmental study, including ideas from the Green Mobility Challenge. Multiple alternatives will be evaluated during project development in the EIS. With public input we hope to develop a mobility solution that respects the environment and adds value to the Oak Hill Community. Comment noted regarding direct connectors at SH 71 and preference on the concepts.
7	Jones	Dave	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Likes the direct connectors. Questions if the overpass at Convict Hill is needed.	Comment noted. Concepts, including an overpass at Convict Hill, will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
8	McClure	Donald	5/23/2013	Comment Form	"I prefer Concept A with Option 1"	Comment noted.
9	Montgomery	Beverly	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Provided proposal for changes from Concerned Citizens for a Safer 290W, in addition to a letter with proposals. 1) Install a signal light at Joe Tanner with a feeder lane having its own light. 2) Place a "No Right On Red" at the old Albertson Center and no yield sign for east bound SH 71 traffic and US 290.	Comments and proposals are noted. The interim intersection improvements to be constructed within the next few years may address these safety concerns.
10	Moran	Theresa	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Concerned about pedestrian safety, there are no sidewalks on the north side off Silvermine from SH 71 to Old Bee Cave Rd., or from Old Bee Cave to Thomas Springs Rd. Students, children, men and women try to walk in these areas.	Pedestrian improvements including sidewalks are being considered during project development in the EIS. Additionally, we are working with the City of Austin and community to identify locations for shared use facilities (hike and bike trails) to be incorporated into the project where feasible.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
11	Nyland	Don	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Says exit ramp-side street proximity needs to be reevaluated because double lefts at RM1826 may affect the ramp.	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. The proximity of exit ramps to side streets will be evaluated.
12	Ready	Michael	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Says need to take into account local deer population and ways to mitigate their crossing the road.	Comment noted.
13	Ready	Michael	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Says will need to address El Rey, Candeleria, and US 290; Candeleria intersects El Rey just before El Rey intersects US 290. Suggest either Candeleria cutting through US 290 service road or a new connection made between Candeleria and El Rey. Does not support Candeleria as a cul-de-sac.	Comment noted. Concepts, including access from US 290 intersections with El Rey and Candeleria, will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
14	Rogers	Laura	5/23/2013	Comment Form	“Please move forward and build a freeway to relieve the congestion. Right of way acquisition for the area was complete 17 years ago. Move forward and build the road improvements.”	Comment noted. A combination of public concerns and funding constraints led to the Oak Hill section of the larger US 290 project to be placed on hold. Due to amount of time that has passed since the original EIS, a new environmental study is required by NEPA, which we are now undertaking.
15	Rogers	Dan	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Prefers 2007 alternative first, then Concept A. Wants to build as much grade separate capacity as possible, quickly.	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
16	Seiler	Ken	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Wants SH 71/ US 290 direct connectors, not at grade intersection for higher traffic volumes. Wants discussion of traffic projections on side streets if main lanes are tolled. Says traffic will increase on Convict Hill if main lanes tolled. Says this is not a substantial/appropriate length of freeway for toll. Does not want tolls on project.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See Response 4.</p> <p>Traffic volumes and patterns will be considered as part of the EIS, as will direct and indirect cumulative impacts such as property values.</p>
17	Short	Van	5/23/2013	Comment Form	"I support Option 1 to improve Circle Dr. I support which ever concept that provides the greatest capacity. US 290 is a U.S. designated highway and should be improved to the degree to carry the great amount of through traffic generated west of the study area."	<p>Comment noted. Concepts and Option 1 will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. Improving mobility is a key purpose of the project study.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
18	Thayer	Tom	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Favors Concept B, at grade, boulevard like design. Wants the project to end at 1826 and the designs to be modified to avoid the creek. Wants a study of how each will affect the trees. Can it be financed without tolls?	<p>Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process, including concepts providing an opportunity to reflect a boulevard or parkway type facility. See Response 6.</p> <p>We are utilizing the City of Austin's arborist in evaluating options and protection of existing trees where possible.</p> <p>There are parkway elements included with some of the concepts, particularly the SH 71 segment of Options B, D, E-1, and E-2 and with the US 290 frontage road segment between the Y and William Cannon for concepts B, C, E-1 and E-2. We are developing a new concept based on input from Fix290. Multiple alternatives are being evaluated, including Non-Toll and No-Build options. However, because the CAMPO Plan lists the project as a toll road, tolling some element of the Build Alternatives will likely be considered.</p>
19	Voellinger	Leonard	5/23/2012	Comment Form	"I like concept A and C along with Option 1. You really need to fix the Y. The other alternatives are just bandaids."	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
20	Voellinger	Leonard	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Says that 1826 and Circle Drive are not logical termini. Wants FHWA guidelines to determine traffic termini. Likes Option 1 that moves traffic past Circle Dr.	Comment noted. Concepts and Option 1 will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process in coordination with the FHWA.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
21	Warren	Ritchie	5/23/2013	Comment Form	“ Too many options – Build Option ‘1’ w/ Concept ‘A’”	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
22	Watts	Alan	5/23/2013	Comment Form	Likes Concept B and its ability to expand to Concept C in the future, and Option 1.	Comment noted. Concepts, and their possible phased implementation, will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. Option 1 will be continue to be evaluated in the EIS.
23	Zamarripa	Ricardo	5/23/2013	Comment Form	“I prefer Concept C which appears to offer the greatest mobility.”	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. Improving mobility is a key purpose of the project study.
24	Calvert	Lindsay	6/3/2013	Web Mail	Says the presentation and concepts were well organized, and staff was interested and engaged. Likes the below grade option and agreed with most of ideas in Concept A. Wants a turnoff from US 290 to the shopping centers at US 290/SH 71. Wants to see more consideration given to pedestrian and bike traffic, especially for crossing SH 71. Did not see a parkway option. Says there was no mention of tolls at the meeting.	Comment noted. There are parkway elements included with some of the concepts, particularly the SH 71 segment of Options B, D, E-1, and E-2 and with the US 290 frontage road segment between the Y and William Cannon for concepts B, C, E-1 and E-2. We are developing a new concept based on input from Fix290. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. Multiple alternatives are being evaluated, including Non-Toll and No-Build options. However, because the CAMPO Plan lists the project as a toll road, tolling some element of the Build Alternatives will likely be considered.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
25	Chapman	Kimberly	5/28/2013	Web Mail	Says spoke with staff a few weeks ago and attended the virtual open house but could not attend the coming sessions. Wanted to convey that she does care about the process. Says did not see announcement for the virtual open house through the newsletter, only through <i>Community Impact</i> . Wants project to reconsider moving Joe Tanner light because it may cause accidents at the YMCA and make Joe Tanner unusable for accessing US 290 eastbound.	The virtual open house was developed to provide additional opportunity for public involvement in the environmental study. It was activated prior to the May 23 open house to June 3 and featured nine concept videos and two real-time chat sessions for questions and answers.
26	Chapman	Kimberly	5/28/2013	Web Mail	After reviewing the videos, does not want the Joe Tanner light removed. Does not think that lane-change traffic and large vehicle use has been adequately accounted for. Likes the concept that attaches Patton Ranch to McCarthy, but only with a light. Says that would allow people to get onto US 290 in either direction from McCarthy. Says connecting Patton Ranch and McCarthy would relieve Joe Tanner problem and then could move the Joe Tanner light.	Comment noted. The Joe Tanner / US 290 intersection is going to be relocated with the intersection improvement project planned by TxDOT. Regarding a more long-term solution to the US 290/SH 71 West corridor, concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
27	Chapman	Kimberly	4/27/2013	Web Mail	Says family is a frequent user of Joe Tanner to enter US 290 and MoPac. Supports the idea of making Joe Tanner a right turn only light, because it currently is clogged by those waiting to go straight. Says is unclear from the <i>Community Impact</i> article, about if the light at Joe Tanner will be completely removed or pushed further back. Suggests timing the lights to enable traffic to cross all three US 290 eastbound lanes safely. Says it is dangerous to enter the westbound US 290 from facilities along the feeder road, especially those who want to use the left hand turn lane and something needs to be done to address this.	Comment noted. Response 26.
28	Clark	Barbara	5/25/2013	Web Mail	"I have lived here for over 30 years now. We have had the money for 290 west before and you have always used it for North Austin. I have waited many years to see this updated, But I know now I will never see this in my lifetime, but please get this built for everyone that lives out here."	See Response 14.
29	Cook	Susan	6/3/2013	Web Mail	Says the "Y" is a major interchange and should remain free, at grade, and not be an overpass. Prefers ideas from Fix290 workshops. Says building overpasses does not follow the trend of less driving. Does not support tolls. Wants the road to be widened and straightened out, does not want private companies running roads.	See Response 4.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
30	Finan	Sally	6/3/2013	Web Mail	Supports Concept A. Says direct connectors for local access are important so is minimizing impact on Williamson Creek, heritage oak trees, and hike/bike paths.	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
31	Fossum	Michael	5/28/2013	Web Mail	Concerned about the impact and fate of the heritage trees in each concept. Wants to know if the project will abide by Austin's heritage tree ordinance.	Comment noted. While TxDOT does not follow City of Austin ordinances, we are utilizing the City of Austin's arborist in evaluating options and protection of existing trees where possible.
32	Gonzales	Albert	5/22/2013	Web Mail	Wants to know why there isn't a parkway alternative. Does not support any of the concepts. Says TxDOT/CTRMA need to provide alternatives that include a parkway. Wants the team to go back to the drawing board. Says "this act by TxDOT and CTRMA appears to be intentional, malicious and possibly criminal".	See Response 24.
33	Grove	Celia	5/28/2013	Web Mail	Wants a non-tolled option studied and built. Says cannot afford tolls and should not be expect to pay taxes for a toll road. Says toll roads are already a problem in Austin. Says comment period was inadequate and was unable to view options online.	See Response 4. The official comment period was from Tuesday, April 23 through Monday, June 3, 2013 per state regulations. The virtual open house was developed to provide additional opportunity for public involvement in the environmental study. It was activated prior to the May 23 open house to June 3 and featured nine concept videos and two real-time chat sessions for questions and answers.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
34	Halpin	Beki	5/29/2013	Web Mail	Says there is no real parkway option, which is what the community most wants. Wants a study of non-tolled alternatives. Says showing the designs was rushed and less transparent and the concepts were not reproduced in the <i>Austin Statesman</i> or the <i>Oak Hill Gazette</i> . Says it was hard to find the concepts on the open house website and that they were unlabeled and difficult to manipulate. Says no mention of funding or costs. Thinks the process of input was good but design roll out was rushed and there was no time to consider and discuss attributes as a community. Supports the no-build alternative and wants to leave the creek and trees undisturbed.	See Responses 24 and 33. Preliminary cost estimates for concepts will be developed as detailed analysis continues in the EIS process. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
35	Henderson	Randall	5/23/2013	Web Mail	Offers three suggestions: 1) concrete barricades at the intersection of westbound US 290 and Joe Tanner 2) Place a “No U-Turn” sign at westbound US 290 and SH 71 3) Place 55 MPH signs at end of westbound US 290 before Joe Tanner.	Comments and suggestions are noted. The interim intersection improvements to be constructed within the next few years will address some of these safety concerns.
36	Hoffman	Kevin	5/29/2013	Web Mail	Says prefers Concept A after attending meeting at Clint Small Jr. Middle School, prefers any concept other than no-build. Says no-build would be a travesty and congestion at US 290 and SH 71 is already bad. Preference Rank: A, C, B, D.	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
37	Lake	Ralph	6/3/2013	Web Mail	Says positively impressed by studies, concepts, and response to public input. Supports Concept A. Says minimizing impact on Williamson Creek, heritage oak trees, and providing hike/bike paths are important.	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. See Response 6.
38	Larrey	Louis	5/30/2013	Web Mail	"I am in favor of Concept A with option 1"	Comment noted. Concepts and Option 1 will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
39	Macauley	David	6/3/2013	Web Mail	Thankful for the open house and the opportunity to ask questions of the TxDOT representatives. Wished that there had been 3D renderings of the concepts. Would like to know if one or more of the Concepts was designed under the assumption of a toll road. Opposed to toll roads. A viable public thoroughway is required. Says Concept A looks the best but is concerned about lack of exits on westbound US 290, and Old Bee Cave Rd. exit is critical for the grocery store, shopping center, and restaurants. Likes the US 290 through lanes below grade, but disappointed in the lack of attention to alternative modes of transportation and says plans should include future right-of-way for mass transit system/commuter rail. Wants more direct response to community's request for a parkway v. freeway.	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. As alternatives are considered in more detail, 3D renderings may be prepared as part of the study. See Response 4. A key purpose of the study is to increase multimodal travel options and coordination will continue with Capital Metro. See Response 24.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
40	Melton	Bruce	6/3/2013	Web Mail	Says that the public felt it had to choose between the alternatives instead of having the ability to contribute to concepts, and TxDOT and CTRMA need to fairly include a parkway alternative. Also wants the public to be more involved in the design process. Disliked that the only way to “interject the community vision of a parkway” was through the official comments. Believed that making official comments online was complicated and difficult to locate. States that a parkway is an “access controlled highway without frontage roads” and that TxDOT/CTRMA stated the definition does not exist. Offered specific design concepts that included shifting the road away from the bluff, adjusting the entrances to shopping centers and William Cannon passes over the Y. Other concerns were the economic impacts, the “economic injustice” of tolls and traffic growth figures.	Comment noted. There are parkway elements included with some of the concepts, particularly the SH 71 segment of Options B, D, E-1, and E-2 and with the US 290 frontage road segment between the Y and William Cannon for concepts B, C, E-1 and E-2. We are developing a new concept based on input from Fix290. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. Environmental justice and traffic volumes will be considered as part of the EIS, as will direct and indirect cumulative impacts.
41	Miller	Walter	5/9/2013	Web Mail	"Has a tunnel been considered?"	A true tunnel concept has not been developed. However, based on public input, there are large portions of Concept A that are depressed, including the main lanes of US 290 under the SH 71/ US 290 frontage road intersection.
42	Phillips	Davis	5/25/2013	Web Mail	Does not support any of the concepts, because it does not include a parkway option. Supports a low speed traffic circle approach.	See Response 24. We will investigate if the capacity of a traffic circle will adequately handle the expected volumes and meet the purpose and need of the projects.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
43	Richardson	David	5/18/2013	Web Mail	Says the EIS team is engaged in the project and that it is clear that the team has been listening to the community's ideas. Requests that Wade Strong's PDFs be made available online for the community to scrutinize. Says a problem with Concept C is where Old Bee Cave Road intersects with the frontage road near HEB, because it requires eastbound travelers to exit the main lanes before William Cannon. Says Concept B offers more direct access and recognizes that C had more support than B at the meeting. Says that a problem with B is keeping the lanes elevated to where they merge with existing main lanes and Joe Tanner. Likes the boulevard design of Concept B. Says it was informative and responsive to community interests.	Comment noted. The PDFs of the concepts are available for viewing or download at www.oakhillparkway.com . Concepts, including access at old Bee Cave Road, will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
44	Richardson	David	5/24/2013	Web Mail	Says Scenic Brook neighborhood doesn't like elevated lanes of Concept A. Changing main lanes to frontage road will increase congestion at Scenic Brook (Concept B). Proposes: a bridge structure North West of Silvermine, two Texas turn-arounds for Scenic Brook neighborhood traffic, move entrance to mall south east or one at Meadow Hill, before Y. Lanes merge with weaving distance from Scenic Brook. Says would maintain the desirable boulevard of Concept A in Concept B.	The suggestions mentioned are being evaluated.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
45	Rofles	Kevin	5/27/2013	Web Mail	Says opposed to Concepts A, B, C, and D and Option 1 because they have too wide a footprint that will destroy the mature Oak Hill Trees. Says E1 has good potential but footprint too wide and none represent a parkway. Supports narrower version of Concept E1 or No-Build Alternative.	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process. See Response 18.
46	Ross	Jennifer	5/28/2013	Web Mail	"When did WE decide to make 290 a toll road?"	See Response 4.
47	Rubottom	Angela Taylor	6/3/2013	Web Mail	Says disappointed that there was no parkway design included, and is not in favor of any of the concepts. Wants the designers to go back to the drawing board and include a parkway.	See Response 24.
48	Sosa	Guadalupe	6/2/2013	Web Mail	Says returning home from the YMCA is dangerous due to crossing two lanes of traffic at the end of the highway. Wants this fixed. Wants to see a real parkway to encourage people to enjoy the beauty and businesses of the area. Wants the trees and creek to be showcased, not destroyed. Says access to business and YMCA should be very important in the plans.	Comment noted. Safety and access issues in the area of the YMCA will be evaluated. Regarding parkway comments, see Response 24. Multiple alternatives will be evaluated during project development in the EIS. With public input we hope to develop a mobility solution that respects the environment and adds value to the Oak Hill Community.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
49	Straup	Brian	5/29/2013	Web Mail	Says the backup at the Y is due to traffic's inability to move after it has passed through the Y intersection, eastbound traffic stops at William Cannon and then again at Joe Tanner. Wants the Joe Tanner light eliminated, along with the light at ACC Pinnacle and William Cannon. Says that congestion will likely result from Concept E1 and cites MoPac as an example of what could happen.	Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
50	Street	Andrea	5/22/2013	Web Mail	Wants only a parkway alternative and grade level improvements that save trees and Williamson Creek. Says the community wants to keep Oak Hill special, while working with TxDOT to redesign the Y and consider the environment.	See Response 24 regarding parkway comments. Regarding ground level improvements, we will investigate if a concept that is limited to this type facility will meet the purpose and need for the project. A number of innovative concepts and ideas will be considered as part of the environmental study, including ideas from the Green Mobility Challenge. Multiple alternatives will be evaluated during project development in the EIS. With public input we hope to develop a mobility solution that respects the environment and adds value to the Oak Hill Community.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
51	Thayer	Thomas	6/2/2013	Web Mail	Thanks the team for all the hard work that has gone into the project. Says that the requirement to vote on concepts was disliked, would have rather been allowed to comment on what the community specifically liked segment by segment. Wants a study of tolled v. non-tolled effects on frontage roads. A tree impact study should be done for each concept. Likes depressed lanes west of the Y. Would like cost estimates for next time. For SH 71, likes Concept B, for shopping center entrance, likes E1. Concerned with Concept A's impact on the creek and would like options without frontage roads between the Y and Joe Tanner. Says main bottlenecks are the Y and William Cannon, fixing this should be a priority. Says save money by ending project at FM 1826. Likes the shared path from one end of the project to the other – provides connection between East and West Oak Hill.	<p>Comment noted. Concepts will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.</p> <p>See Responses 4 and 18.</p> <p>Preliminary cost estimates for concepts will be developed as detailed analysis continues in the EIS process.</p>
52	Tull	Bonnie	5/23/2013	Web Mail	Wants to know why there isn't a parkway alternative. Does not support any of the concepts. Says TxDOT/CTRMA needs to provide alternatives that include a parkway. Wants the team to go back to the drawing board. Says "this act by TxDOT and CTRMA appears to be intentional, malicious and possibly criminal"	See Response 24.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
53	Worrel	David	5/17/2013	Web Mail	Attended workshop on 5/16. Wants to know if there are copies of current maps for each concept and a one pager that describes each concept in 2-3 sentences.	This information is provide on the project website, www.OakHillParkway.com
54	Ziegler	Leigh	5/23/2013	Web Mail	Concerned about the “Important Trail Crossing” indicated as #2 and says it does not follow the direct path behind SW Pkwy and SH 71. Suggests a linear path behind the motel with less impacts. Wants to know what an “Important Trail Crossing” is.	The information regarding the proposed trails was provided by members of the Oak Hill Trails Association. We will share your comment with them and will continue to coordinate with them in developing a shared-use path for our project that compliments a proposed trail network. We defer to the Trails Association, but it appears the term "Important Trail Crossing" indicates proposed locations where the trails would cross major roadways.
55	Richardson	David	5/23/2013	Court Reporter / Verbal Comment	Says favorite is Concept B, but there needs to be better access at Convict Hill. Says in the current plan they have to go past Convict Hill or make a left hand turn, and that both are inefficient. Suggested a graded intersection near Oak Meadow with a weaving lane starting east of Oak Meadow prior to arriving at Convict Hill. Says another issue is eastbound traffic merging into main lanes and suggest an additional ramp from Convict Hill.	Concepts, including neighborhood access at Convict Hill and merging into main lanes, will continue to be evaluated through the environmental impact statement process.
56	Beckley	Doug	5/23/2013	Court Reporter / Verbal Comment	Says this should have happened years ago. Says the problem is getting worse due to construction towards Dripping Springs and Bee Cave. Says that the best solution will be the one that costs the least.	See Response 14.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary						
#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response
57	Moran	Theresa	5/23/2013	Court Reporter / Verbal Comment	Does not want to be forced to use a toll road when exiting her neighborhood. Can accept a toll road on US 290 but not at all on SH 71. In concepts proposed there are multiple obstacles to reaching HEB from SH 71. Says current turning lane works well. Prefers lower lanes compared to raised lanes. Says higher lanes impact neighborhoods and cause pollution.	Under the concepts presented at the open house, frontage roads provide for the local access and will not be tolled. See Response 4. Regarding HEB access, we will be studying this further.
58	Johnston	Andy	5/23/2013	Court Reporter / Verbal Comment	Was on a design team for the Green Mobility Challenge and left an attached proposal. The proposal leaves a natural setting to the creek. Says that direct connectors for east bound SH 71 would be good. Concept C is first choice, then A. Hopes that green infrastructure and riparian habitat can be integrated.	See Response 6. The proposal left behind in being evaluated.
59	Straup	Brian	5/23/2013	Court Reporter / Verbal Comment	Says lives on Callbram Lane, inside the Y and accesses SH 71 and US 290 through Scenic Brook intersection. Does not want a super structure at the intersection. Says that the lights at SH 71 and US 290 automatically block traffic, and the traffic cannot get past William Cannon. Suggests elevating William Cannon and removing the intersection at Joe Tanner so there is only one stop at the intersection of SH 71 and US 290.	Comment noted. Concept E-1 most closely matches this comment.