

EXHIBIT D

Exhibit D displays all public comments received during Phase IV of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) as of Wednesday, March 27 at 3:00 p.m. Phase IV began on Friday, February 22 when the final draft of the ASMP was released.

In addition to the communication in items 1-55 (pages 1-7), two letters received from organizations, Save Our Springs Alliance and West Austin Neighborhood Group, are also included on pages 8-9 and 10-12, respectively.

All comments received during Phase I through Phase III are available online at AustinTexas.gov/ASMP.

ID	Source	Comment or Question
1	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello! I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to South Bay and Escarpment Boulevard.</p> <p>I am a Circle C resident with two children who attend Kiker Elementary School; I also commute daily to work at the University of Texas main campus, and am very familiar with these parts of Circle C. These proposed changes would directly and very negatively impact my family, and I hope these changes will NOT be greenlit for implementation.</p> <p>Escarpment Boulevard from the south loop of Redmond Road - sometimes as far south as South Bay! - to La Crosse is gridlocked every morning between 7:15 and 8:00 during Kiker dropoff. It already can take me up to 40 minutes in bad weather if driving down Escarpment to reach Kiker - less than two miles away. This traffic is so bad, in fact, that I no longer drop my children off in the intended dropoff driveway - I take the back way and drop them off behind Kiker instead. I cannot even imagine the added nightmare of additional traffic cutting through during this same time period as they seek to avoid Mopac rush hour traffic - and the proposed four lanes would bottleneck down to two at this point, making that intersection exponentially worse and more dangerous!</p> <p>Adding additional traffic to Escarpment would also be a huge risk to our children's safety as many children walk to school, as cars coming from the high speed limit on 45 would almost certainly be speeding through 35 MPH stretch of La Crosse where they would be entering and driving alongside children walking and biking to Kiker.</p> <p>Similarly, extending South Bay to Mopac would draw potential cut-through traffic to a stretch of road dotted with middle and high school bus stops and already an unsafe stretch of road - I was T-boned and had my car totaled when a car blew through a stop sign at South Bay and Pebble Garden, which happens to be the exact spot my daughter will wait for the bus next year when she goes to Gorzycki. This stretch of road is far too pedestrian heavy - it is where most of our neighbors walk to get mail from the cluster on South Bay - to introduce highway cut through traffic. I shudder to think of the impacts on that stretch of road, even without considering the fact that adding a stop light at South Bay on Mopac after months and months of work to create underpasses at Slaughter and Mopac would completely undo all the good these projects have done for our neighborhood! The Slaughter Lane underpass easily saves me 10-15 minutes of traffic - so thank you for prioritizing keeping traffic flowing on Mopac!</p> <p>Please, I am practically begging you - DO NOT greenlight any projects that would bring highway cut through traffic to these two roads that are so critical to our children's safe passage to school from Kindergarten through graduation from high school. It will bring unsafe drivers to the roads our children depend on to walk and bike to and from school, and would make the already ridiculous traffic on Escarpment south of La Crosse even more unbearable.</p> <p>I noticed the initial feedback on these proposed enhancements was roughly 50:1 negative to positive. I am wondering why, in the face of such truly overwhelmingly negative citizen feedback, these "enhancements" are even under consideration at this time. I very much hope the ASMP will keep our children's safety first and foremost when thinking of these proposals and will remove these from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you, (name redacted)</p>
2	ASMP Inbox	<p>TO whom this may concern,</p> <p>I saw the transportation updates on plans to widen south Austin roads: https://communityimpact.com/austin/southwest-austin/transportation/2019/02/26/transportation-updates-austin-strategic-mobility-plan-expanded-roadways-in-south-austin/?utm_medium=social&utm_source=facebook_Community_Impact_Southwest_Austin&fbclid=IwAR3oK7K5fMR0v5SYenn_oNffGnYrcTtOmLj8xUKUkOfX9OxsTuE3q8a3kYM</p> <p>I am writing to voice my concern regarding widening Escarpment Boulevard to a four-lane road from La Crosse Avenue to the Hays County line south of SH 45. This is a neighborhood and widening streets through this neighborhood will encourage more traffic where there are many family and children pedestrians. Please remove this portion from your plans.</p> <p>I am in favor of all other street widening plans presented in this update as they are not streets that run directly through the middle of dense neighborhoods.</p> <p>Thank you, (name redacted)</p>
3	ASMP Inbox	<p>We do NOT need Escarpment Blvd expanded to 4 lanes between 45 and Slaughter Lane!!! I have lived in Circle C for almost 23 years! The traffic is still manageable-but has recently worsened due to drivers using Escarpment Blvd instead of 45 and Mopac which are under construction. Once Mopac opens completely many cars will use that route instead of Escarpment Blvd.</p> <p>Also there are too many kids and residents biking and walking on a Escarpment that will be endangered by multiple lanes!!!</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT EXPAND ESCARPMENT BLVD!!! (name and address redacted)</p>
4	ASMP Inbox	<p>I can't make the meeting but officially share my grave concerns about widening Escarpment to add lanes. This area is not safe with that type of traffic coming off 45, with multiple schools and one more coming. Children will get hurt and killed. This will also divide the Circle C Ranch Community into unrelated towns. -(name redacted), resident</p>
5	ASMP Inbox	<p>I know you will get a ton of negativity from the CircleC community about this proposed project, but I live in Circle C and believe that it really needs to stretch from as far north as Slaughter Lane. To go from 2 lanes to one back to two does not make sense to me. So I would be more in favor of this if it was a more wholistic proposal for all of Escarpment.</p> <p>Also please keep as much of the parkway feel as possible with the natural land for a medium. The main reason we moved to CircleC was the green space. Thanks, -(name and address redacted)</p>
6	ASMP Inbox	<p>To the City of Austin Transportation Department, Mayor Adler and Council Members of Austin:</p> <p>Please accept the following comments regarding the final draft of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan. The main point I would like to emphasize is the disconnect between the Roadway Capacity Projects Map and all the other goals of the ASMP as they pertain to making Austin a multimodal city. The Roadway Capacity Projects Map should be amended to deprioritize roadway expansion and new roadway projects to truly allow other multimodal goals to thrive.</p> <p>The Roadway Capacity Projects Map (pg. 93) shows an imbalance between roadway expansion projects on the east and west sides of the city, raising concerns of equitable safety, induced air pollution, increased impervious cover and flooding, inequitable geographic distribution of housing burdens, etc. Planned roads - before they are even built - spur sprawl and low density development. Just look at Houston's history of beltway planning. A majority of these new eastern roadways should be removed from the plan to focus on encouraging infill development across the city, not spur more low density sprawl before they are even built. This same map also shows a disconnect between goals of reducing per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and encouraged multimodal transportation use. More roads / more lanes equals more personal vehicular use and less support for rail / existing bus / existing bike, etc. Induced demand is real. And so is climate change and our existing transportation-related carbon emissions. The extensive Expanded Roadway layer also demonstrates a disconnect between safety goals of Vision Zero. Wider roadbeds with more lanes degrades safety and prioritizes cars over more vulnerable road users. The Draft Roadway Capacity Projects Map is copied below for convenience: [Map on page 93 of final draft ASMP included]</p> <p>Please revisit the draft Roadway Capacity Projects Map to realign proposed projects to actually support public and active transit use, as well as encourage infill development vs. ever-expanding city limits and low-density sprawl. If left as is, build out per the proposed roadway map will undercut many other goals.</p> <p>Thank you for review of this matter, (name redacted)</p>
7	ASMP Inbox	<p>Thank you for your response - I have since sent another concern regarding the scooters on the street - that are going the wrong way in the traffic lane and seem to think the cars are the ones in the wrong! Something has to be done. Also - on Red River and Davis and a block north - most days the scooters and bikes totally clog the sidewalk - these are abandoned scooters and bikes not ones being ridden - you can't even get down the sidewalk.</p> <p>I know this is not an easy task - but if we don't take action soon it really is going to be too late. Thanks (name redacted)</p>

ID	Source	Comment or Question
8	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear ASMP,</p> <p>I sent the letter below to my council representative, but I wanted to include your division on this thread because I think you may be able to help with the issue of bike lane debris. I have been reading about the Mobility Plan and I am encouraged by many of the ideas it presents. I want to bring attention though to the problem of maintaining the existing systems and paths that are already in place. See my letter below for a list of streets in Austin that I know are part of a bigger problem city-wide. In addition, I ask you to consider the following ideas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are there not better maps of the bike routes and trails in the city? I know of the PDF that summarizes the whole system, but it would be helpful to have point-to-point maps for each route and trail so that you can visualize that segment. Having additional maps that show popular routes would also be useful. For an example point to point, view this map that I created for Austin Bike Route 22. <p>Austin Bike Route 22 [web application] From Brentwood to Jester -- 8.8 mi, +809 ft. Starts in Austin, TX</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Consider this situation. I live in Allandale and work in The Domain. I can take a bus that costs \$2.50 per day to work or I can drive my car for under 50 cents per day. We need solutions to encourage short trip commutes that are affordable. The one-fare-fits-all doesn't work for such scenarios. Maybe we need to add some zone-based fare systems so that when you travel within a short distance, your fare could be reduced to something that would encourage use of the bus. 3. Encouraging biking/walking is great, but consider that the weather is not always amenable to such modes of transportation. When it is above 80 degrees, it's not comfortable to bike/walk to work -- especially if there are no showers available at your workplace. I'm not sure electric scooters are the answer to this either. <p>Thank you for listening, (name and address redacted)</p>
9	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Council Member Pool,</p> <p>I live in your district, but I want to bring your attention to a problem that is city wide. The city builds bike lanes and designates bike routes all over the city, but after these lanes and routes are created, they fill with rocks, sand, and debris. There is no way to use these lanes and trails. I want to bring your attention to several roads where I know there are problems of examples of the bigger concern I have.</p> <p>Burleson Rd (rocks, glass) Pleasant Valley Rd (rocks, debris) E 7th St (rocks, sand, weeds) E 51st St (rocks, sand, large holes) Howard Lane between Cameron and toll road (clods of dirt and grass) Cameron to Harris Branch (sand, dirt) Rundberg - shared lane markings are obscure</p> <p>Many of these problems make it impossible to ride in the bike lane.</p> <p>The above is unacceptable. I was riding on these roads on Saturday and I suffered a puncture in my rear tire because of the trash. I would prefer to ride in the bike lane, but if the lane is full of trash and debris, it forces me to ride in the lane. Perhaps we should start thinking about having communities get involved with keeping the bike lanes/trails clear so that full burden is not on the city? In the mean time, can we please just send the street sweepers to clear the lanes and perhaps city crews can fix the problems with areas such as Howard/Cameron/Harris and E 51s where the problems are more serious and creating dangerous situations for riders and drivers?</p> <p>Thank you for listening, (name redacted) (address redacted) Council District: 7</p>
10	ASMP Inbox	<p>I think I found an error on the map. Take a look at Wooten Drive where it crosses the railroad track. This road has never crossed the track, has barriers, and a pedestrian-only railroad crossing. Maps like Google Maps used to show this as a through street, but it has never been a through street. This new ASMP map shows it as a level 2 street (only for the portion crossing the tracks). That is weird, since crossing the track is pedestrian only. I suspect this is an error.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
11	ASMP Inbox	<p>Could you please tell me when this proposed new road was added to the new Feb. draft ASMP roadway map? I did not see it on the previous DRAFT map...</p> <p>Whose suggestion was it to add this proposed new road? Was it a proposal by City Staff??? Was the proposed new road considered to be part of the Redbud Trail Bridge Project???? Did a number of city of Austin residents fill in the ASMP survey demanding such a new road across an historic municipal golf course????</p> <p>Was Council Member Alter notified that this new road was being added to the current draft ASMP proposal? If so when????</p> <p>Wouldn't a "new road" be considered as a "change" to the existing Neighborhood Plan for this area? Has the Contact Team for the Central West Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan been informed of this proposed addition??? Such a future road was NOT part of the recommendations for the future in the 2010 approved CWACNP.</p> <p>Has a traffic study been done to show what impact such a road would have on Pecos St.? Pecos has been experiencing ever more traffic that is coming off of MoPac. Wouldn't a Redbud Trail connector send even more traffic up and down Pecos????</p> <p>I would appreciate a reply prior to the beginning of the City Council Mobility Committee tomorrow afternoon at 1 p.m.</p> <p>Sincerely, (name redacted)</p>
12	ASMP Inbox	<p>ASMP,</p> <p>I live in Circle C and am also a Professional Engineer in Texas and have tons of experience in traffic and transportation engineering. Here are a few thoughts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Escarpment is not a major thoroughfare. It was not intended for heavy, high speed traffic. It is a collector street for Avana and Circle C. The City and ASMP are trying to turn it into a major thoroughfare. It is an easy fix for them since the ROW is there. We don't want it since it is a neighborhood not a freeway. 2. There is no point to extend South Bay. There is no need for it to be extended. Just because the ROW is available that makes it easy for construction is not a valid traffic need. 3. Let's wait and see how the 45SW connection effects traffic counts on all of these streets. Please share before and after traffic projections with the public as these current improvements come into play. 4. Please activate the 45 connection to 290 again. That would help the Y situation. 5. The Slaughter bridge configuration is unreal. The Braker/MoPac bridge configuration would work adequately. Keep Austin Weird fits Slaughter. So many people avoid it and impact other streets like Davis and a Escarpment. 6. Focus on pass thru traffic using MoPac and not Escarpment. 7. Improve 1826 first. 8. Most importantly, get a major thoroughfare plan written like Harris and Fort Bend have had for 25 years. 9. The City and the County have to bit the bullet and buy ROW for new roadways in our area like Harris County and Fort Bend County have on their thoroughfare plans. 10. Last and not least, all of these traffic plans for our area will not improve but make worse the congestion from the bridges at Sunset Valley to downtown . When are those improvements schedules to take place? <p>Thanks for hopefully reading my comments.</p>
13	ASMP Inbox	<p>Can you explain the logic behind expanding Escarpment btwn 45 and Lacrosse? Shouldn't that traffic be using 45/MOPAC? What is the current TPD on that stretch and what is the planned future? I don't see how a traffic model would support that expansion unless the plan is to have MOPAC horribly congested and people cutting thru the neighborhood? And with Escarpment remaining 1 lane each way from LaCrosse to Slaughter, I really don't understand it.</p>
14	ASMP Inbox	<p>This is probably the dumbest comment ever, but I thought I'd suggest using a different primary image on the cover of the final report. The Congress Avenue image, while engaging, is pretty out of date with regard to transportation (CapMetro doesn't run buses on Congress anymore, to say nothing of scooters...).</p> <p>Just a dumb little thought. Thank you for all your work on this.</p> <p>cheers,(name redacted)</p>

ID	Source	Comment or Question
15	ASMP Inbox	<p>It dawned on me that northbound Mopac from Slaughter Lane up to the river will never have enough lanes to handle the existing traffic, much less the traffic being added from SH45 and new growth south of Travis county.</p> <p>It would be relatively inexpensive to add metered on-ramps at all intersections with two lanes: 1) a non-metered HOV entrance for motorcycles, carpools, buses, etc. 2) a metered entrance that allows one car per green light, as seen in other cities around the country.</p> <p>This will allow buses and carpools to maintain regular, efficient service, making them more favored, and penalize single drivers at peak hours, further encouraging the use of higher density transportation.</p> <p>In nearly all cases, there is enough paved roadway already in place, only the lane markings need to be modified, along with added signal lights and monitoring.</p> <p>The key northbound entry points are from: Loop 360 Southwest Parkway/Westbound 71/290 Eastbound 71/290 William Cannon Davis Lane Slaughter Lane</p>
16	ASMP Inbox	<p>I appreciate all of the work that went into the ASMP. The Final Draft is significantly different from the draft version; in particular, it includes all of the Indicators and Targets, the Action Items in the back, and the commute-to-work percentages. Our only opportunity to provide input now, as I understand, is at public meetings. It is difficult for many people to attend those meetings, and three minutes is a short amount of time for substantive comments. I understand that you did not want to overwhelm people with information in the draft, but I do not think that it's fair to the public for the final draft to have so much more content to respond to.</p> <p>I have a few questions at this time.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How did you arrive at the goal of 16% commute-to-work by transit by 2039? I don't think that's high enough. The VMT stays about the same. 2. Did you model or try to estimate the mode share for all trips, not only to work? The majority of trips are not work trips. 3. Annick said at the Mobility Committee meeting that the ASMP includes a Transit Priority Policy. Please tell me where that is, as I do not see it anywhere in the document. There is a "Transit Enhancement Program" mentioned, but that is developed in closed-door meetings between ATD and Cap Metro, and there is no mention of public involvement or criteria that the public can see. A Transit Priority Policy should have been part of the ASMP. <p>Action item 85: "Identify additional near-term transit priority improvements and transit-supportive projects through the Transit Enhancement Program."</p> <p>Transit priority lanes, "transit pathways", are not mentioned in any of the action items, though that is one of the major strategies listed on p. 4. (Managed lanes on the freeway are different.)</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
17	ASMP Inbox	<p>How can i determine what is proposed for my mother's neighborhood and more specifically for her street? She is a senior citizen taking care of my father who has limited mobility as well as they have two neighbors; one with sight limitations and the other confined to a wheel chair. She lives on Harris Boulevard in Pemberton Heights. The document is so extensive that it effectively provides no information. I have spent over an hour scouring through the plan as well as the interactive map.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
18	ASMP Inbox	<p>Rob, (name redacted) and I would like to register our opposition to any plan that the City may be considering to connect Pecos St. and Redbud Trail that would compromise Lions Municipal Golf Course. The map that we have see would affect at least five holes on the back nine, to some degree. The land available for golf at MUNY is limited and there would be no way to preserve the historical integrity of the course if the plan were to proceed. We hope that further study on-site will lead you to that conclusion as well. We are glad to visit with you at your convenience. Regards, (names redacted)</p>
19	ASMP Inbox	<p>I live in the new Greyrock Ridge neighborhood of Circle C at the end of MoPac in SW Austin. Many of the neighbors would like a turn-around put in on westbound 45 and Escarpment so that we can get to our neighborhood without stopping at 2 lights at the 45/Escarpment intersection to turn around to head to our neighborhood. The SW45 toll road builders should have put this in to mitigate the noise and traffic they are bringing to our neighborhood, and mitigate the blight of the huge bridge they built at the entrance to our neighborhood, and to increase safety for pedestrians crossing 45 to use the shared use path (by pushing fewer cars through the existing intersection lanes).</p> <p>I do not know if a turnaround lane on 45 and Escarpment would technically be the responsibility of TXDOT, the SW45 toll road, or the city. Please let me know if a turnaround in the middle of 45 and Escarpment would be something that can be included in the city mobility plan, and if so, how I can send in a comment making this request.</p> <p>You have permission to forward this to my Austin city council member, TXDOT, 45SW toll people, and/or to publicly file this with comments to the city's mobility plan. Thank you. (name, address, and phone number redacted)</p>
20	ASMP Inbox	<p>A street and bridge right through the Waller creek boathouse?</p> <p>If that's emblematic of the thoughtfulness of this plan, it was a tremendous waste of time, and money.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
21	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi Warner and Annick:</p> <p>Very nice to meet you all at Environmental Commission the other night. Thank you for being so helpful.</p> <p>On the three Circle C issues, we would probably need to see a footnote or something that provides some clarification. Is this possible within the plan?</p> <p>I am thinking: Escarpment Boulevard from SH 45 to Lacrosse --striping only, medians remain intact, no new street lanes</p> <p>Dalhgreen Avenue, portion owned by Circle C Homeowners Association (not developed) *subject to permission from CCHOA per Settlement Agreement Between City of Austin and the Circle C Homeowners Association</p> <p>South Bay Lane, portion owned by Circle C Homeowners Association (not developed) *subject to permission from CCHOA per Settlement Agreement Between City of Austin and the Circle C Homeowners Association.</p> <p>South Bay Lane, portion across Tract 110, owned by Stratus Properties *subject to the Settlement Agreement between Stratus Properties and the City of Austin</p> <p>I can pull the documents on these for you early next week. I know you are crazy busy and thank you so much!</p> <p>(name redacted) on behalf of the Circle C Homeowners Association (phone number redacted)</p>
22	Phone Call from Community Member	<p>Phone call from president Wyldwood-Kellywood Neighborhood Association, (name redacted): Mr. (name redacted) expressed concerns about what the roadway expansion project recommended in the ASMP for Brodie Lane south of Slaughter would consist of. He also asked where the recommendation originated. He was not in favor of adding travel lanes south of Brodie Lane towards 45SW, but did feel there was support in the area for bicycle facilities and pedestrain facilities. Followed up with information abotu the recommendations being those from the preliminary engineering of Brodie as a substandard street in the 2016 Mobility Bond and passed along that report. Also clarified that ASMP recommends the addition of a center turn lane, but not additional general travel lanes.</p>

ID	Source	Comment or Question
23	ASMP Inbox	<p>Mr. Rivera - I am an Allandale resident who has recently reviewed the Burnet Rd. Project Report and sections of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP). You're identified on a CoA website as the Planning Commission liaison and thus, appear to be a good contact to whom my concerns should be addressed, especially with the upcoming meeting on 03/26. Please do let me know if there is an engineer and/or person in decision-making capacity whom i and other concerned Allandale residents can contact re: the flaws in the Burnet Rd. redesign.</p> <p>THIS COMMUNICATION IS LENGTHY, BUT IT ADDRESSES EXTENSIVE MUNICIPAL DOCUMENTS AND MULTIPLE, REASONED CRITICISMS OF THE BURNET REPORT. BECAUSE OF ITS LENGTH, I'VE ALSO ATTACHED IT IN PDF. DOCUMENT FORM FOR EASIER USABILITY.</p> <p>As an active participant on the Allandale Neighborhood Assn. listserv, i've observed that many local residents have expressed a significant degree of apprehension regarding the Burnet Rd. Corridor Plan - in particular the initial project spanning Koenig to Anderson Lane. The most glaring, perhaps - within the context of the ASMP - is its' inconsistency with this document's roadway policies which state, in part:</p> <p>"Austin's roadway system has not kept up historically with the amount of growth our region has experienced. More importantly, the roadway system was never built to manage today's population size which continues to grow. This insufficient investment in our roadway system and the number of people that use it are largely responsible for the congestion and unreliable travel times we experience today. ... New roads and improvements to existing roads and intersections are necessary to keep up with the amount of growth Austin has experienced and continues to experience. ... Other improvements, such as constructing turn lanes and traffic signals or even innovative intersections, such as continuous flow intersections, can also add vehicle capacity."</p> <p>The Burnet corridor plan is designed to impede vehicle mobility by replacing existing turn lanes with medians and exclusion of bus pullouts which not only did Mayor Adler propose just prior to the 2016 mobility bonds, but are also recommended by NACTO to improve transit flow (although CapMetro opposes these for prioritization of bus transit). We all recognize CapMetro does not and will not efficiently serve many Austin residents for many years to come.</p> <p>Burnet Rd. is an arterial roadway, much as pro-density urbanists would like to disregard this reality. 37% of the 'Corridor' planned paved space is allotted to vehicles (bus and auto) with the remainder for pedestrian/bicycle/tree-medians. This is hugely disproportionate to the actual transit occurring on Burnet Rd. - and will be for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Given the Austin climate and the personal freedom, workplace environment, and even, health required to use bicycle transit is this plan in any way realistic for most travelers? It is not. And you undoubtedly know that Shoal Creek Blvd. (SCB), just 1/3 mile west of Burnet Rd., is currently being used by many bicyclists - sometimes like a veloway. Is there really a justifiable need to also make accommodations on Burnet Rd., an arterial roadway, for this type of, and low percentage of, transit? When drivers become so frustrated traveling on Burnet Rd., will they opt for SCB as the alternate N/S arterial roadway?</p> <p>Do we want pedestrians on Burnet Rd. to be safe? Of course, which is why pedestrian hybrid beacons (PHBs) should be supported /installed on very long blocks, and even better, aligned with bus stops (when not near intersections) as is the case just south of Anderson Lane. Incidentally, for not only the cited PHB, but others located in my general area, i have never once seen a motorist breach a PHB - if for no other reason than we are also pedestrians.</p> <p>Regarding the planned consolidation of driveways, i can't in good conscience (for both vehicle and pedestrian safety) fully oppose this (a limited degree seems reasonable), but is CoA's right-of-way really as wide as noted in the aerial images of this plan, consuming most of the businesses along this stretch of Burnet Rd.? Has CoA checked the property deeds and restrictions to verify this? The ANA has and disagrees. It should also be noted this reconfiguration would require changes to the Land Development Code (LDC) and Transportation Criteria Manual (TCM), giving the ATD director the discretion to deny access and to modify access design based on certain criteria.</p> <p>And then there are the parking options - including zero - proposed in this report. Coupled with the elimination of turn lanes, the neighboring streets will be used as traffic and parking overflow - ask any resident how s/he feels about the consequent reduction in privacy and neighborhood safety, not to mention increased noise. What about residents in need of emergency services - will emergency vehicles have sufficient access to timely assist them? And a more general question is: how will the local businesses survive this design pushing back usable property to a significant degree.</p> <p>Page 18 of the Burnet Rd. Project Report shows a full 120 feet of paved space (cited as within the ROW), which includes 16' for bike travel (both sides), and 18' tree-lined median replacing turn lanes, and 22' of planting zones (both sides). Here's a realistic proposal: 1) eliminate the bike lanes as this mode of travel is only 4% and is already accommodated just west of Burnet; 2) leave the turn lanes to help with traffic flow, emergency vehicles, and access to local businesses; 3) IF Austin truly has the funds to irrigate planting zones, reduce the width of these (or eliminate them); and 4) yes, improve the sidewalk system for better pedestrian safety.</p> <p>And it would be great if APD would ticket the many drivers who do not use turn signals when changing lanes, and cite those offenders who run red lights.</p> <p>I do thank you, Mr. Rivera, (and others on the cc: list) for your time and effort in reviewing these concerns, also expressed by other Allandale residents, and presenting them at the 03/26 Planning Commission meeting. Again, please let me know if there are other appropriate CoA staff whom i should contact re: the Burnet Rd. plan.</p> <p>Best, Stephanie Ryan</p>
24	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello ...</p> <p>I'm looking at the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan "Street Network" map online. It shows the proposed extension of Industrial Oaks over to Southwest Parkway.</p> <p>Is this recommendation presently planned to go to the City Council?</p> <p>It's much discussed in the Travis Country Subdivision, and we've included it in our monthly newspaper, TC Notes.</p> <p>Your notice says the plan is "nearing the finish line". Is there a target date for presentation to Council?</p> <p>If the Industrial Oaks extension is indeed part of the plan, when might it be under construction if it's approved by Council?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
25	Written Feedback	<p>How will Cap Metro incorporate the Rainey neighborhood into the high capacity line at Trinity-Riverside identified in Project Connect? Which Specific short-term initiatives can be implemented?</p> <p>Please widen sidewalks, add a drop-off area for TNCs, and introduce surge pricing for on-street pricing.</p>
26	Written Feedback	<p>With all the pressure on the need for more roads to handle the traffic, what is the likelihood we can keep Biore (check spelling) Alley fully open to River Street instead of only diverting the alley onto Rainey Street?</p>
27	Written Feedback	<p>Thank you for organizing this. I appreciate the presence from the City and would like to see more from them going forward. I'm very interested to know what we can do to create rapid progress on smaller/easier projects related to mobility.</p>
28	Written Feedback	<p>I have never seen a biker getting a ticket for traffic violations in Austin. We all need to obey traffic laws. Are scooters motorized. They are all over my car and around it. Have not seen a license plate on one.</p>
29	Written Feedback	<p>In favor of bringing Amsterdam public transit to Austin.</p>
30	Written Feedback	<p>Circulators/small buses like Dillos/charriot to give access for elderly or people who can't bike or walk. Service road traffic is awful in order to get onto 35.</p>
31	Written Feedback	<p>It seems that Austin's planning and transportation have a disconnect. Should we not have access and ROW that will work before building mega high-rises between Cesar Chaves and the MAC?</p>
32	Written Feedback	<p>Austin is Texas only truly urban core city in that 90% of the things that give it its identity are either downtown or within a 1-2 mile radius. Consequently, I think the downtown area should do away with many streets and make them pedestrian, bike, or scooter only. Provide ways to park outside of downtown and use alternative transportation forms within the downtown area consisting of at least one square mile area.</p>
33	Written Feedback	<p>Why is the city pandering to the MAC constituents that want a "park" over the safety of our neighborhood? This is so awful that you would consider condemning the alley way to spill onto Rainey - Fire Safety?</p>
34	Written Feedback	<p>Enforce traffic circle round-a-bout regulation - very dangerous. I would like to see brakes put on the building. One way and alternative side parking on Rainey. Make area where bars/restaurants only pedestrian. Better control or eliminate scooters on Rainey - very dangerous. Better monitoring of illegal parking.</p>
35	Written Feedback	<p>Has there been any consideration to opening the alley way behind hotel Van-Zandt and to Rainey?</p>
36	Written Feedback	<p>Very interested in protecting the trail from motorized vehicles and reducing driving lanes, would like to see more mass transport alternatives, including trams, trains. Would like more controls on scooters and motorized bikes.</p>
37	Written Feedback	<p>Is there any strategy for increasing ridership in existing Capital Metro vehicles? Most are under utilized, almost empty. Has anyone considered using smaller cans for satellite areas and use the larger buses for corridor service?</p>

ID	Source	Comment or Question
38	Written Feedback	<p>#1 We are very concerned about the safety and mobility issues associated with the alley vacation behind 70 Rainey at the MACC gate. It is putting form over function and safety. Also, it appears that "closed-door" meetings brokered a deal for that. What is our best course of action to prevent the vacation?</p> <p>#2 Density in the Rainey area expected to triple in 5 years. How/when do we upgrade sidewalks, clean up scooter "litter," and ensure safety in an already super-dense area that is underserved by streets and quality sidewalks?</p> <p>#3 You mention "right-of-way." What eminent domain actions are being considered? What is the process to be informed and part of a fair resolution to land grabs?</p> <p>#4 It seems from observation that lack of enforcement of scooter laws is a contributor to operator misbehavior. How closely does ATD work with APT to prioritize this?</p> <p>#5 Which specific department within ATD is responsible for recommendations on alley vacations? What is best means of contacting?</p>
39	Written Feedback	<p>Hi ASMP Team -</p> <p>Does this essentially mean the existing sidewalks become shared use paths, or we would be losing green space and adding impervious coverage in an aquifer recharge zone to make room for a second paved pathway? Or are both options potentially on the table if this passes (which I still sincerely hope it does not).</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
40	ASMP Inbox	<p>I am one of a number of leaders in the Rainey District community. The ASMP document is very long. The maps are also so concentrated it is difficult to see what aspects of the mobility vision pertain to the Rainey area.</p> <p>Could you have someone either email or phone me (979-575-3211) with the pages in the 300+ document that specifically either mention or show the mobility plans for the entire Rainey neighborhood? If they are not already in the plans, could I make arrangements to have pertinent documentation picked up from the appropriate City staff?</p> <p>I will then communicate that to other community leaders and get back to the ASMP if we need further information or wish to further get involved with your mission.</p> <p>Thank you. (name redacted)</p>
41	ASMP Inbox	<p>Please get serious. You cannot solve the congestion on streets by removing traffic lanes. Bus and rail service does not extend to all of Austin thus forcing many people to travel by car. You make Austin's reputation as a traffic nightmare worse by removing or impeding auto traffic. Something needs to be done about the parking lot known as RR620 between 2222 and 183 as well as Anderson Mill Road sooner rather than later.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
42	ASMP Inbox	<p>This city is suffocating itself in traffic, and all city leaders know it, are scared of it and have no idea what to do to alleviate it.</p> <p>If you were collectively intelligent, you would seriously consider aerial tramway systems to get people OFF the ground, while at the same time providing safe, fast, and cheap transportation.</p> <p>Re: do some research - start at Portland's aerial tram system, then Canada's, then everywhere else in the world where city leaders are beating you to the punch. Good grief, the answer is right there in front of your eyes.</p> <p>Oh, and for once, PLEASE consider South and Southwest Austin when you do so!</p> <p>(name redacted) Oak Hill</p>
43	ASMP Inbox	<p>To the City of Austin Transportation Department, Mayor Adler and Council Members of Austin:</p> <p>Please accept the following comments regarding the final draft of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan. The main point I would like to emphasize is the disconnect between the Roadway Capacity Projects Map and all the other goals of the ASMP as they pertain to making Austin a multimodal city. The Roadway Capacity Projects Map should be amended to deprioritize roadway expansion and new roadway projects to truly allow other multimodal goals to thrive.</p> <p>The Roadway Capacity Projects Map (pg. 93) shows an imbalance between roadway expansion projects on the east and west sides of the city, raising concerns of equitable safety, induced air pollution, increased impervious cover and flooding, inequitable geographic distribution of housing burdens, etc. Planned roads - before they are even built - spur sprawl and low density development. Just look at Houston's history of beltway planning. A majority of these new eastern roadways should be removed from the plan to focus on encouraging infill development across the city, not spur more low density sprawl before they are even built. This same map also shows a disconnect between goals of reducing per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and encouraged multimodal transportation use. More roads / more lanes equals more personal vehicular use and less support for rail / existing bus / existing bike, etc. Induced demand is real. And so is climate change and our existing transportation-related carbon emissions. The extensive Expanded Roadway layer also demonstrates a disconnect between safety goals of Vision Zero. Wider roadbeds with more lanes degrades safety and prioritizes cars over more vulnerable road users. The Draft Roadway Capacity Projects Map is copied below for convenience:</p> <p>Please revisit the draft Roadway Capacity Projects Map to realign proposed projects to actually support public and active transit use, as well as encourage infill development vs. ever-expanding city limits and low-density sprawl. If left as is, build out per the proposed roadway map will undercut many other goals.</p> <p>Thank you for review of this matter, (name redacted)</p>
44	ASMP Inbox	<p>I just read the "Final Draft" of your plan. It was very disappointing. Some thoughts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roughly 60% of your focus group preferred an option where roadway projects were either preferred or "balanced"; yet you managed to come away with a "preference" for public transportation. Was the manipulation intentional or incompetent? • The sidewalk section seems to prioritize areas with existing sidewalks over areas that don't have sidewalks. In Austin it is illegal to walk in the street; not to mention dangerous. Yet, the city prefers to replace/refurbish existing sidewalks? • As with most Austin plans, the plan assumes it will manipulate public behavior. I have been around Austin since the 70's, and watch virtually every attempt by the government to manipulate public behavior fail, going back to the "if we don't build infrastructure they will not come" of the late 70's. This plan echos that approach: if we don't build roads people will stop driving. Hogwash. This is TX where it is often over 100 degrees for weeks or months. People will not stop driving. • One final thought: Austin is not what the government made it, it is what the people made it despite the government. Please stop trying to foist your naive and idealistic idea on those of us that actually hafta function here. <p>I could go on, but I suspect this will fall on deaf ears.</p>
45	ASMP Inbox	<p>Wouldn't it be nice to have a right turn lane at LaCrosse with the bridge closing? Even if it's temporary pavement. 🙄 what's your thought now?</p>
46	ASMP Inbox	<p>Thank you for your response. I do have other questions regarding the streets in Rainey. There are two alleys, one east of Rainey Street and one west of Rainey Street. How does each fit into the mobility plan? Sandra, I, Carmen and Taylor were at a meeting with Annick and a number of transportation staff that made some comments on these alleys. What specifically is in the mobility plan regarding each of them? Also, was Bierce open all the way to River Street or is it closed to River and only diverted onto the new paved roadway south of 70 Rainey and north of 64 Rainey onto Rainey Street itself?</p> <p>Two last questions regarding both alleys. First, are they being recommended to be one way or two way? If one way, in what direction? Second, will the City be paving the alley east of Rainey, waiting for developers who build large buildings to pave it, or is there some other solution to make it passable and useable?</p> <p>We greatly appreciate your attention. THANKS again!</p>
47	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello, I've been reading through the latest/final version of the ASMP. I was curious as to how/what extent my prior feedback had been incorporated (or not).</p> <p>My understanding is that there would be staff responses to our prior feedback. In fact, the latest ASMP presentation to the UTC includes a slide with the statement " All comments & staff responses are available online".</p> <p>Online I can see the comments, but I don't see any corresponding staff responses.</p> <p>I.E. on http://www.austintexas.gov/page/asmp-timeline</p> <p>There's a link for Public comments on maps from Phase III https://app.box.com/s/ycjsvgtq7bdcfimv5oflu8pszkwh2p0y</p> <p>But that document doesn't seem to include any staff responses. Are those available anywhere?</p> <p>Thank you</p>

ID	Source	Comment or Question
48	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello, We have experienced wait times in the Garage E located within the Capitol Complex that are 45 minutes or longer. The main source of problem is the number of people leaving to move either north to MLK off of Colorado Street or go south on Colorado to 15th. We have requested parking on the other side of MLK for those who live East and North of Austin with little success. However, if a shuttle could be added in front of the Bob Bullock museum (like a Dillo bus) that could park at a dedicated section of the museum each day to move through MLK from Colorado to San Jacinto. The public and people working in the Capitol Complex would use the parking garages located on San Jacinto and 15th Street, instead of off Colorado and 17th Street.</p> <p>There are have been numerous near fatalities and the Department of Public Safety is interested only in working at the Capitol and the State Preservation Board is not willing to consider removing the parking meters along Colorado which is creating more congestion behind and to the side of the Bob Bullock Museum.</p> <p>The bus lanes for UT students get caught on Lavaca doing left turn from the center lane on Lavaca St. onto MLK. I think that could be moved to the left side of the street just past 17th.</p> <p>Thank you. (name, address, and phone number redacted)</p>
49	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hey there.</p> <p>I haven't looked at the final draft but I did want to chime in on scooters. I almost took down my first scooter rider last week (SXSU) at 5th and West Ave. When I passed him initially he was on the sidewalk by Whole Foods near Lamar going east on 5th. Then when I was stopped at the light at 5th and West waiting to turn left, I looked in my rearview mirror and he was in the car lane 2-3 cars behind me. When my light changed to green I waited for some dog walkers to go through the crosswalk and just as I stepped on the gas to turn left the guy on the scooter zips right around me in the crosswalk and I had to slam on the brakes.</p> <p>I guess what I'd like to see is clear rules and consequences for scooters and other non-automobile vehicles. Are they allowed in crosswalks? And if they are, they should travel only on sidewalks, not in the car travel lanes. If they're not allowed in crosswalks then they should follow the same rules as automobiles. And what are the fines (besides maiming or death) if they're caught where they shouldn't be traveling? And will the police enforce these? It's so frustrating to be a driver not knowing what is allowed and trying to do the right thing.</p> <p>Thank you for listening!!</p>
50	ASMP Inbox	<p>I live in Great Hills and have concerns about increased traffic near Great Hills Trail/Jollyville/ 183/ Braker when the new development at that location occurs. Traffic is already terrible here. I believe the city mandated that the developer do something to mitigate the increase in traffic but no resolution to that problem was found and the development was allowed to continue anyway.</p> <p>With very large developments like the one in Great Hills, it is possible to add an extra traffic lane/ right turn lane the length and perimeter of the property by taking it out of the periphery of the footprint of the development. In other words widen 183, Great Hills Trail and Jollyville Road by at least one lane by taking that real estate out of the developers footprint. Same with The Grove in Central Austin.</p> <p>Can you please tell me if that has been mandated for the proposed development at Great Hills Trail and Jollyville????</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
51	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi, Mandy - nice to hear from you. I've deleted all but the last two responses to reduce the amount of text that gets dragged into everyone's inbox.</p> <p>You mention the city intends to refine the plan over the next year or so - is this really accurate? The timeline shows presentation to the City Council in the near future. Have contracts been developed yet (even if not initiated) with all the design elements which frankly, seem more about land use, than transportation? Yet, the city is - at least as known to the public - (again) in the incipient phases of revisions to the land development code (with Greg Casar's resolution as an apparent exception).</p> <p>Burnet Rd. differs considerably in character throughout its length, with the city portion south of 183 - and of most concern and significance, south of Anderson Lane - requiring a different design from that further north.</p> <p>Does the CoA have data specific to the Koenig/Anderson portion demonstrating that raised medians - pushing traffic into neighboring streets and jeopardizing the economic health of local business - are justified by left-hand turn crashes which you can share with me? I ask because the research on raised medians set forth by the Federal Highway Administration is far more qualified than the planned approach illustrated in the Burnet Rd. Project Plan, in stating these barriers are not appropriate in some circumstances for a number of reasons:</p> <p>https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/saferjourney1/library/countermeasures/16.htm</p> <p>The planned bike lanes represent to me and undoubtedly other reviewers, that this community, cited in the ASMP as 1.3% of travelers, has a disproportionate influence on city policy. This simply is not equitable or realistic for users of the major forms of transit - auto and bus. The ASMP's reference to the 36 mile off-road Razorback Regional Greenway in NW Arkansas is so disconnected from the stated concept of bike lanes on major roadways in Austin that it seems, at best, unnecessary to inclusion in the plan.</p> <p>Even the projected/hoped for increase in bikers (for transit, not recreation) and pedestrians, is not expected to significantly increase compared to, for example, public transit. And as mentioned previously, Shoal Creek Blvd. just west of Burnet Rd. already serves this purpose although the sharing of parking and bike lanes has been noted as problematic, with proposed solutions underway. And finally, the previously proposed idea for bus pullouts, which would have helped w. traffic flow, has been discarded, only compounding the problem w. travel by auto.</p> <p>As always, thank you for your time in reviewing these concerns. Best, (name redacted)</p>
52	Phone Call from Community Member	<p>Phone call from President of Milwood Neighborhood Association about absent sidewalks, the sidewalk dataset and problems with the data, Safe Routes to School, substandard streets, and the Duval Rd corridor study.</p>
53	Email to ATD staff	<p>The City of Austin has made a great deal of progress in sidewalk accessibility improvement throughout the years. However, the Americans with Disabilities Act was passed in 1990. All sidewalk accessibility improvements were required to be finished in 1995.</p> <p>The requirements of Mobility Plan need to reinforce the city's commitment to the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Sidewalk Master Plan. The sidewalk master plan only surveyed a third of the city with the idea that we were going to come back and finish the rest have to work that needed to be done in a reasonable amount of time. That's not reflected in the Mobility Plan.</p> <p>The Mobility Plan includes a recommendation for urban trails yet, it doesn't mention that Butler Trail remains and accessible to people with mobility and visual impairments. This is due mostly to maintenance issues and no plan to address ongoing maintenance of the trail.</p> <p>The plan mentions the need to address overgrown vegetation to improve and maintain sidewalk accessibility but makes no mention of how to get there. The city should create a local version of the citizens Conservation Corps to deal with vegetation and some minor Trail maintenance. We've been talking about the need to address vegetation and maintenance for the lawn as we could remember but until we devote resources to the issue it's just empty talk.</p> <p>Equity in Transportation</p> <p>Since Capital Metro Bus Service has moved to Rapid Transit adapt members have been experiencing hostility from drivers when they get behind schedule. Many of us have been passed up others of us have had bus drivers call the cops on us when we challenge the idea that they can't pick us up when they're empty bus is too full. There needs to be Outreach down to law enforcement so that they understand Disability Rights so that when Metro drivers call the cops on us police can say that's not a priority.</p> <p>Scooters</p> <p>The City of Austin needs to ensure that scooter companies provide accessible options and ensure that users of the scooters do not block accessible travel throughout the city.</p>

ID	Source	Comment or Question
54	Email to ATD staff	<p data-bbox="384 222 454 251">Annick</p> <p data-bbox="384 274 1961 325">I have been unable to determine if in the revised Mobility Plan the proposed traffic signals at Windsor and 24th and the traffic light at Harris and Windsor are still in the revised plan. I am sorry but I have not been able to navigate the new plan on the internet.</p> <p data-bbox="384 348 1978 422">Several Old Enfield neighbors who are very concerned that Windsor in front of their houses will be subject to more cut through traffic if the light is put there have been asking me and I don't have an answer for them. Also the Pemberton people who have the same concerns of increased cut through traffic if a light is placed at Harris and Windsor have been asking me and I don't have an answer.</p> <p data-bbox="384 445 1978 496">Also when we met you mentioned that someone at your office would know more about what is proposed at the West Lynn and Enfield intersection. Can you give me the name and email address of the person on your staff that can explain to me what is proposed in the revised plan for the Windsor and West Lynn intersection?</p> <p data-bbox="384 519 598 548">Thank you in advance</p>
55	Email to ATD staff	<p data-bbox="384 536 764 565">Dear Mayor and City Council Members:</p> <p data-bbox="384 588 1952 639">The Circle C Homeowners Association, which represents the 5,600 homes and 17,000 residents of Circle C Ranch, is pleased to support the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, including the changes that affect the Circle C roadways which have been agreed upon during the process.</p> <p data-bbox="384 662 1978 736">We would like you to know that we had a very positive experience working with the ASMP team of Annette Beaudet, Warren Cook, Cole Kitten and Daniel Brooks. They took feedback from both individual Circle C residents and the CCHOA, asked for follow up materials, and made decisions in a timely and effective way. They will be reading some clarification language regarding Escarpment Blvd. into the record at the Pubic Hearing on March 28, 2019.</p> <p data-bbox="384 759 1821 788">We appreciate their efforts, and would like to congratulate all of you for the hard work on the ASMP. Thank you for your service to the citizens of Austin.</p> <p data-bbox="384 811 484 839">Sincerely,</p>



March 26, 2019

Sent Via Electronic Communication

Planning Commission
City of Austin
301 W. 2nd Street
Austin, TX 78701

Re: Please Remove SH45 SW from the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan

Dear Planning Commissioners,

The Save Our Springs Alliance is extremely appreciative of the direction of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan to move the City of Austin towards a more comprehensive transportation network that emphasizes and prioritizes more environmentally friendly modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities and mass transit. Generally, we are supportive of the overall plan and the additional recommendations of the Pedestrian Advisory Council (PAC) and the Urban Transportation Commission (UTC). This is not meant to be an endorsement of every particular word or recommendation, but rather support for the overall direction that this City must take if we are going to protect our limited natural resources (e.g., land and water) and respond seriously to the threats of climate change.

While many of the transportation decisions within our region require collaboration with state and regional entities, we believe it is imperative that the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) truly reflect the **strategic** vision of the City of Austin itself. While other entities may have requested that new roadway and highway projects be reflected on our plan, some of these projects may not fit within the goals of our community. One such project is SH45 SW in Southwest Austin, and we respectfully request that you **remove SH45 SW from the ASMP**.

It is our understanding that the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) requested that a new highway improvement project be shown to extend SH45 SW to connect with I-35, completing what would essentially be a western I-35 bypass for Hays County traffic. Travel pattern analyses sponsored by TxDOT have shown that such connection could increase vehicular traffic on South Mopac by 6-11% and on Brodie Lane by upwards of 17.6% (Source: SH 45 SW Extension: Analysis of Travel Patterns and Network Impacts, by CDM Smith, February 24, 2016). Additionally, this highway would induce sprawl by facilitating suburban style, car-focused development on environmentally sensitive lands.

SH45 SW is not in-line with Imagine Austin. In fact, **SH45 SW was expressly removed from Imagine Austin by the City Council** when the comprehensive plan was adopted, and in September 2012, the City Council requested its removal from the CAMPO 2035 Regional Transportation Plan to align with Imagine Austin's goals. Then again in 2014, via Resolution 20140515-063, the City Council reaffirmed "its position that the proposed SH45 SW is not part of the future transportation network of Austin and . . . its opposition to SH45 SW" (resolution attached).

Austin's water watchdog since 1992

905-A West Oltorf Street · Austin · Texas · 78704 · 512-477-2320 · SOSAlliance.org

We ask, as our preferred outcome, that you support the recommendation of the UTC by removing SH45 SW from the draft map (located on Appendix C, Page A15) of the ASMP, along with the related expansion of South Mopac. This is the cleanest option to show that Austin is serious about prioritizing 21st century solutions over 20th century sprawl.

However, in the event that you feel compelled to leave the highway improvement on the map, we ask that you include language within your motion for approval of the plan, which would expressly reaffirm the City of Austin's opposition to SH45 SW. Below is some suggested language for you to consider:

Alternative Suggested Language for Motion. The City of Austin reaffirms its opposition to SH45 SW, in accordance with the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan and Council Resolution 20140515-063. The extension of this highway improvement has been included within the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan only to acknowledge that it has been listed as a potential, future project by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and may require City of Austin participation for right-of-way acquisition. As part of an action item of the ASMP, City of Austin staff is directed to continue to collaborate with TxDOT and other regional agencies on alternative mobility solutions to mitigate the need for this new highway project and to prioritize transportation dollars on projects that will serve existing populations in areas that will support transit and multi-modal connectivity.

As always, thank you for all of your work on behalf of our city. The ongoing efforts of the PAC, UTC and now the Planning Commission on the ASMP will be critically important to ensuring that Austin has a mobility system responsive of the environmental challenges we have before us.

Respectfully,

Bobby Levinski
Attorney,
Save Our Springs Alliance
bobby@sosalliance.org
512-636-7649 (mobile)

CC: Annick Beaudet
Cole Kitten



WEST AUSTIN NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP

March 26, 2019

Organized 1973

OFFICERS

Holly Reed
President

Cathy Kyle
Past President

August Harris
Secretary

George Edwards
Treasurer

BOARD MEMBERS

Mary Arnold
Joyce Basciano
Joseph Bennett
Michael Cannatti
Haidar Khazan
Craig Lill
Brady Pedneau
Blake Tollett

The Honorable Mayor Steve Adler
Mayor Pro Tem Delia Garza
Austin City Council
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78701

RE: City Council Meeting Agenda 3/28/2019 Item #50: Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) Final Draft

Honorable Mayor Adler, Mayor Pro Tem Garza and Council Members,

On behalf of the West Austin Neighborhood Group Board of Directors, I write to respectfully ask that you consider the following **changes to the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP)** final draft before voting to approve the plan as an amendment to the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan:

1. We are opposed to the inclusion of a new roadway, entitled the REDBUD TRL-ENFIELD RD CONNECTOR, in the ASMP Final Draft. This proposed Level 3 roadway (2 travel lanes with a center turn lane) runs right through the middle of Lions Municipal Golf Course. It was added to the ASMP final draft AFTER the closing of public comment. **Adding this roadway to the ASMP is premature, and undermines negotiations between The University of Texas and the City of Austin** working towards an agreement whereby the City of Austin will acquire and preserve the Historic Lions Municipal Golf Course in its entirety. The presence of this road in the ASMP will have a negative impact on current and future negotiations.

Further, this new roadway is inconsistent with the ASMP's policy on Health and Environment, to **"Avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse impacts of the transportation network on natural and cultural resources"** as stated in ASMP Draft Plan, Feb. 2019 page 200:

"Our transportation network is essential to getting people where they want and need to go, but it has the potential to harm the natural and cultural resources that help make Austin a great place to be. Natural resources include many of the things we immediately think of when we think of the environment: greenbelts, our trees, parks and preserve lands, the Colorado River, and our creeks, ponds, and springs. While cultural resources may not necessarily be classified as "nature," they are still important to our sense of community identity and hold special meaning. Historic places and buildings, cemeteries, and iconic landmarks can all be cultural resources and must be upheld through historic preservation initiatives. By considering the impacts transportation decisions have on our environment, we can avoid or minimize harm and better practice long-term stewardship of our resources."

Lions Municipal Golf Course is a natural and cultural resource, an historic place, and iconic landmark. It has received a Texas Historical Marker for its early desegregation, and was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2016. The Cultural Landscape Foundation's 2018 Landslide Program, *Grounds for Democracy** highlights Lions Municipal Golf Course as a site of "immense cultural and historical significance" and a "key to remembering, contextualizing and interpreting the struggles for civil and human rights in the United States." Despite its incredible historical significance, its irreplaceable open green space, and vast numbers of heritage oak trees, Lions Municipal Golf Course is threatened by development interests, and now, by the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan. We urgently ask for your support in **requiring that this roadway be removed from the ASMP Final Draft**, before voting to approve this plan.

2. ASMP Land Use, Policy 1: We are opposed to increasing density within ½ mile of ALL transit corridors. This conflicts with the intention set forth in Section LUT P4 of the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan (Land Use and Transportation, p.118)

“Protect neighborhood character by directing growth to areas of change that include designated redevelopment areas, corridors, and infill sites. Recognize that different neighborhoods have different characteristics, and infill and new development should be sensitive to the predominant character of these communities.”

One size does not fit all throughout Austin! More density along ALL the transit priority network and ½ mile into the surrounding neighborhoods does not respect Neighborhood Plans and will destroy older neighborhoods’ unique character by encouraging demolition and inappropriate development. There are appropriate places for more density along certain transit corridors, but not along ALL OF THEM! Please work with Neighborhood Associations to add density in appropriate places.

3. ASMP Land Use, Policy 5: We are opposed to changing development regulations in the LDC to require new and infill developments to have mixed use along ALL transit corridors. Mixed use development is not appropriate along all streets that have a bus stop, particularly in Austin’s urban core residential neighborhoods. Allowing mixed use development along all transit corridors would greatly conflict with the Central West Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan’s Future Land Use Map, and with stated goals in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan’s section on Housing and Neighborhoods:

“In 1997, the City initiated the neighborhood planning program to protect, enhance, and ensure the stability of neighborhoods—mostly located in the urban core. Currently, 48 neighborhood planning areas have completed the planning process and have adopted neighborhood plans (see Appendix G). Challenges and opportunities unique to individual neighborhoods are met through the neighborhood planning process.” -**Imagine Austin p. 135**

HN P11. Protect neighborhood character by directing growth to areas of change and ensuring context sensitive infill in such locations as designated redevelopment areas, corridors, and infill sites.

HN P14. Strengthen planning processes by recognizing that the Comprehensive Plan and small-area plans, such as neighborhood plans, corridor plans, and station area plans, need to respect, inform, and draw from each other.

- **Imagine Austin p.138**

4. ASMP Parking: Policy 2: We are opposed to further reduction of parking requirements in Austin’s zoning codes and we support Residential Permit Parking. It is unrealistic to think that if you eliminate most of the parking, everyone will ride the bus, ride their bicycle or walk to work in TEXAS. This vision may work in other cities, but not in this climate, and not with such limited public transportation. Many commuters have to drive their children to school, and then make it to work on time. Many commuters take equipment to work that cannot be carried on a bus or a bicycle. Again, one size does not fit all in Austin! There may be some areas where reduction of parking would work but not everywhere! Removing more parking requirements will not stop people from driving. It will cause them to park in inappropriate places such as along neighborhood streets, ruining quality of life and causing safety issues for people who live in those neighborhoods. Please work with all the various communities and neighborhoods in Austin to create appropriate levels of parking for each community.

In conclusion, we support the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan's statement that "we must create an efficient transportation network to serve a city of complete communities, activity centers and corridors. In the face of this change, we also need to preserve our unique places, open space and environmentally sensitive areas." We believe both these goals can be attained if the City Council and Austin's citizens work together on the ASMP.

Thank you for considering our requests for these changes to the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan's Final Draft before amending the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Holly Reed". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Holly Reed
President
West Austin Neighborhood Group

CC: City Manager Spencer Cronk, Annick Beaudet, Cole Kitten

* <https://tclf.org/sites/default/files/microsites/landslide2018/lions-golf-course.html>