TO: Mayor and Council Members

Cc: Marc A. Ott, City Manager

From: Robert Goode, P.E., Assistant City Manager

DATE: June 13, 2016 (Updated July 7, 2016)

SUBJECT: **Responses to City Council questions about Mobility Talks and the June 1 Budget Work Session**

This memorandum provides responses to questions the City Council posed to staff during and in follow up to the June 1, 2016 briefing to Council about Developing and Funding Transportation Projects.

How much current funding is available to implement the Sidewalk Master Plan?

There is $3.44 million from all general obligation bond funding sources to implement the Sidewalk Master Plan. All of this funding is assigned to current and ongoing projects except approximately $25,000.*

How much current funding is available to implement the Urban Trails Master Plan?

From all general obligation bond funding sources, there is $4.72 million remaining to implement the Urban Trails Master Plan. All of this funding is programmed for current and ongoing projects.

How much current funding is available to implement the Bicycle Master Plan?

There is $1.26 million remaining from all general obligation bond funding sources. All of this funding, except approximately $540,000, is assigned to current and ongoing projects. The remaining funds will be prioritized through established Bicycle Program criteria. In FY 16, the City of Austin has committed to $420,000 in work to support coordination efforts with street resurfacing and other opportunities that are drawing from this funding source. Remaining funds would be fully committed through cost coordination activities in FY 17.

How much have we spent total on developing the existing Corridor Mobility Development Program reports?

The City has expended $2.53 million for the six existing reports. The breakdown per report is provided below:

- East Riverside Drive Corridor: $600,000
- FM969 (East MLK Blvd) Corridor: $450,000
- North Lamar Blvd and North Burnet Road Corridors: $450,000
- Airport Blvd Corridor: $430,000
- South Lamar Blvd Corridor: $350,000
- Guadalupe Street Corridor: $250,000

Can we model impact of corridor plan implementation and other proposed elements of the package (perhaps using Envision Tomorrow tool) on applicable Imagine Austin Complete Communities Indicators?

Modeling the corridors is not possible in the desired timeframe. The appropriate timing for modeling the network will be during the development of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP), which is scoped and funded for these services. Additionally, the ASMP will use the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan Complete Communities Indicators for determining targets and metrics related to the scenario planning process. The community indicators include Vehicle Miles Traveled and other items mentioned in this question. Staff spoke with the Center for Transportation Research and it was determined that the desired timeframe was not feasible to employ its tools.

Do the stakeholder lists (emails) from the Corridor Planning Processes still exist? If so, can they be leveraged for awareness of the proposed funding of implementation?

These lists are outdated. We recommend using the Community Registry since it is most recent information available. For questions about the Community Registry, you may contact the Communications and Public Information Office at (512) 974-2220. When Bond Elections are called, the City provides educational materials about what would be funded if the propositions(s) are approved and what the impact on the tax rate would be.

What would the scope of Brodie and Parmer Lanes be if funded?

The Texas Department of Transportation would lead the improvements to Parmer Lane. TxDOT has agreed to fund a Preliminary Engineering Report, and the scope of that report as well as the improvements will be determined by TxDOT and its consultant. The initial response from TxDOT is that the scope of work "at this time includes the addition of a third lane, estimated at $17M." The limits are from FM 1431 to SH 45.

See Attachment 6, a memo distributed to Council on Nov. 17, 2014, for information about Brodie Lane.

What is the effect of advanced signalization on level of service, auto throughput, etc.?

One advanced signalization strategy - adaptive signal control - targets an approximate 10% reduction in travel times. The amount of delay improvement varies through the day and whether weekend or weekday. There are multiple case studies that communicate the outcomes associated with adaptive signal control. One such study is from 2012 study by the Colorado Department of Transportation where travel times on two corridors improved by 9-19%. Other outcomes include reduced delays for transit through transit signal priority and faster response times for first responders through emergency vehicle preemption.

What was the process for development of previous Bond Elections?

See Attachment 1.

What did the Mobility Talks survey show was participants' desired mode of transportation to use more often, per district?

See Attachment 2.

What was the previous voter-approved bond funding for transportation expended on? Separate the breakdown of funds that went to bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian infrastructure, and urban trails.

See Attachment 3.

What is the five year history of outstanding Non-Tax Supported as well as Tax-Supported Debt?

See Attachment 4.

Provide a summary of completed sidewalks in the last five years per district.

See Attachment 5.

*The response has been corrected.

xc: Assistant City Managers
Elaine Hart, Chief Financial Officer
Greg Canally, Deputy Chief Financial Officer
Ed Van Eenoo, Deputy Chief Financial Officer
Mike Trimble, Capital Planning Officer
Rob Spillar, Director, Austin Transportation Department
Robert Hinojosa, Interim Director, Public Works Department

Attachments:

Attachment 1: Bond Development

Attachment 2: Desired Mode to Use More Often

Attachment 3: Previous Transportation and Mobility Bond Propositions

Attachment 4: General Obligation (GO) Bonds: Total Debt Outstanding, Including Non-Tax Supported and Tax-Supported Amounts by Fiscal Year

Attachment 5: Completed Sidewalks within the Last Five Years per District

Attachment 6: Memo to Mayor and Council from Transportation Regarding CIUR 1447

Attachment 1: Bond Development Processes 1998-2014

Bond Election	Bond Process Initiated	Process	Bond Place on Ballot	Bond Election Held	Bond Advisory Committee?	Bond Amount	Bond Process Duration
1998	Dec 1997	14 community meetings beginning in March 1998, presented findings and recommendations to City Council July 1998	Aug 1998	Nov 1998	Yes	$339.7M	11 months
2000	Jun 2000	Council discusses bond program in June, holds public meetings in August 2000.	Aug 2000	Nov 2000	No	$163.4M	5 Months
2006	Apr 2005	Staff presented Bond Capacity and Needs Assessment April 2005; Bond Election Advisory Committee (BEAC) convenes May 2005; BEAC Committee and Sub-Committee meetings, and 8 Public Hearings from July 2005 thru January 2006. Final recommendations presented to Council Feb 2006.	Aug 2006	Nov 2006	Yes	$567.4 M	19 Months
2010	Mar 2010	Community engagement held by Task Force April-July 2010. Final package proposed to Council July 2010.	Aug 2010	Nov 2010	Yes	$90M	7 Months
2012	Oct 2011	Engagement held Feb through April 2012, present final bond recommendations to Council in June 2012.	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Yes	$306.6M	13 Months
2013	Jan 2013	Council adopts final bond program in August 2013. Council Receives input from City staff in April 2013, and holds information sessions in October 2013.	Aug 2013	Nov 2013	No	$65M	10 Months
2014	May 2014	CAMPO form Transit Working Group in 2011, Central Corridor Advisory Group takes up evaluation from June 2013-June 2014, endorses Urban Rail route in conjunction with Capital Metro and Austin City Council. Project Connect hosts 250+ meetings starting in August 2013.	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	No; Transit Working Group	$600M	6 Months

Attachment 2: Desired Mode to Use More Often

Results provided in the table on this page were collected during Mobility Talks.

Question: Which mode of transportation would you like to use more often? Rank in order with 1 being the mode you would like to use the most, select N/A if you do not want to use the mode more often.

Desired Mode to Use More Often											
Mode of Transportation	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**D4**	**D5**	**D6**	**D7**	**D8**	**D9**	**D10**	**Citywide**
Bike	22%	16%	30%	22%	20%	16%	25%	19%	30%	20%	23%
Carpool	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%
Driving Alone	10%	18%	7%	10%	18%	22%	12%	20%	6%	20%	14%
Public Transportation	45%	45%	41%	47%	39%	43%	44%	44%	39%	37%	42%
Walk	10%	9%	10%	9%	9%	6%	9%	6%	12%	9%	9%
Motorcycle	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Ground transportation services	8%	6%	7%	7%	8%	6%	6%	7%	8%	9%	7%
Car sharing services	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%

Top Choice
Second Choice
Third Choice

Attachment 3: Previous Transportation and Mobility Bond Elections 1998-2012

Bond Program	Proposition #	Proposition Total	Street Reconstruction	State Highways	Street Improvements	Signals	Pedestrian	Bike	Urban Trails	Mobility (Intersections & Corridors)	Support Facilities
1998	1	**$152,000,000**	$75,508,393	$4,974,145	$33,803,496	$27,463,966	$5,250,000	$4,888,776	$111,224	$0	$0
2000	1	**$150,000,000**	$0	$37,352,877	$82,142,123	$0	$20,000,000	$7,795,597	$2,709,403	$0	$0
2006	1	**$103,100,000**	$82,500,000	$0	$0	$8,000,000	$10,600,000	$1,220,833	$779,167	$0	$0
2010	1	**$90,000,000**	$19,185,000	$0	$0	$4,200,000	$15,551,890	$24,960,207	$2,422,903	$23,680,000	$0
2012	12	**$142,095,000**	$0	$0	$59,020,000	$0	$17,933,300	$8,600,000	$11,966,700	$33,500,000	$11,075,000
TOTAL	**---**	**$637,195,000**	**$177,193,393**	**$42,327,022**	**$174,965,619**	**$39,663,966**	**$69,335,190**	**$47,465,413**	**$17,989,397**	**$57,180,000**	**$11,075,000**

Attachment 4: GO Bonds – Total Debt Outstanding Including Non-Tax Supported and Tax-Supported Amounts by Fiscal Year

General Obligation (GO) Bonds Total Debt Outstanding, Including Non-Tax Supported and Tax-Supported Amounts By Fiscal Year			
	Total Outstanding GO Debt	**Non Tax- Supported GO Debt**	**Tax-Supported GO Debt**
FY 2012	$ 1,167,750,000	$ 232,171,094	$ 935,578,906
FY 2013	$ 1,209,910,000	$ 231,336,726	$ 978,573,274
FY 2014	$ 1,301,120,000	$ 254,148,916	$ 1,046,971,084
FY 2015	$ 1,368,055,000	$ 264,215,720	$ 1,103,839,280
FY 2016	$ 1,434,570,000	$ 267,333,336	$ 1,167,236,664

Attachment 5: Completed Sidewalks within the Last Five Years per District

The following table reflects the total linear miles by Council District of sidewalks built by the City of Austin from December 30, 2011 to June 1, 2016. Both the school service and transit service areas are 0.25 miles around public schools and transit stops (including bus stops and MetroRapid stops) within the City's Full Purpose Jurisdiction.

Table 1

City of Austin Completed Sidewalks from 12/30/2011-6/1/2016

	Inside School and Transit Service Areas* (linear miles)	Outside School and Transit Service Areas (linear miles)	Total of Sidewalks Constructed in District (linear miles)
District 1	8.64	2.11	10.75
District 2	4.56	0.28	4.84
District 3	11.23	1.44	12.67
District 4	6.16	1.69	7.84
District 5	2.71	0.04	2.75
District 6	0.18	0.00	0.18
District 7	10.54	0.14	10.69
District 8	0.38	1.00	1.38
District 9	5.64	0.82	6.46
District 10	0.87	0.30	1.17
Total	**50.92**	**7.81**	**58.74**

*See Table 2 below for further breakdown of completed sidewalks inside school and transit service areas. Sidewalks in this column are only counted once, even if they fall within both the school and the transit service areas.

Table 2 shows the miles of sidewalks built by the City of Austin from December 30, 2011 to June 1, 2016, within either a school service area or transit service area. Note that some sidewalks fall within both service areas, which is why the total numbers by district below do not sum equally to the table above.

Table 2

City of Austin Completed Sidewalks from 12/30/2011-6/1/2016 by service area (0.25 miles)

	Sidewalks Within 1/4 Mile of Schools (linear miles)	Sidewalks Within 1/4 Mile of Transit Service (linear miles)
District 1	2.63	8.47
District 2	1.37	4.49
District 3	2.84	11.23
District 4	1.98	5.69
District 5	1.53	2.42
District 6	0.18	0.18
District 7	3.45	10.46
District 8	0.37	0.03
District 9	2.54	5.09
District 10	0.79	0.87
Total**	**17.68**	**48.94**

**Some sidewalks fall within both the school service area and the transit service area and, therefore, add up to more than the total indicated in Table 1 above.

Attachment 6

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Mayor and Council

CC: Marc A. Ott, City Manager
Robert Goode, P.E., Assistant City Manager

FROM: Robert Spillar, P.E., Director
Austin Transportation Department

DATE: November 17, 2014

SUBJECT: **CIUR 1447 - Brodie Lane Improvements**

On October 16, 2014, the Austin City Council passed Resolution No. 20141016-30 directing the City Manager to develop a timeline and budget for improvements to Brodie Lane between Slaughter Lane and FM 1626. This memorandum is in response to that resolution.

Background

The City of Austin initiated a planning level study to evaluate the potential for a series of intersection improvements along Brodie Lane. The goal of the preliminary effort was to relieve congestion and improve mobility in the southern segment of Brodie Lane due to operational conflicts observed in the field. The investigation included examining single-lane roundabouts at major collector intersections along Brodie Lane, between Slaughter Lane and FM 1626. The intersections that were analyzed for possible roundabout installations are:

- Aspen Creek Parkway
- Squirrel Hollow and Indian Point Drive (roundabout pairs)
- Sesbania Drive
- Sunland Drive
- Gatling Gun Lane

The initial concept for this section of Brodie Lane maintains the roadway as a two-lane facility that includes roundabouts for improved accessibility from the side streets and better facilitates left turning vehicles, and provides a complete sidewalk and/or shared use path connection between Slaughter Lane and FM 1626.

The evaluation indicated that the single lane roundabouts could be mostly constructed within the existing right-of-way and would only require minor right-of-way acquisition at some of the intersection corners. It is anticipated however, that due to the additional impervious cover necessary for the road improvements and the limited area adjacent to the right of way available for water quality controls, an amendment to the S.O.S. Ordinance may be necessary for project implementation. Staff is looking at options that would provide similar environmental protection such as off-site mitigation and treatment of existing untreated development, but a site specific amendment may still be required. Additional corridor level modeling and detailed design and survey data are necessary to identify the most technically appropriate design for the roundabouts and actual right-of-way needs. At some roundabout locations the construction will occur over the existing open drainage ditches that exist

along the west side of Brodie Lane. These intersection improvements will require significant storm water infrastructure modifications.

Approach

This project will require the City of Austin to hire a consultant to develop a Preliminary Engineer Report which will include a detailed traffic analysis, watershed impact determination and remediation plan, and public involvement process. Once that process has completed and the final scope of the project is determined, the next steps would be detailed engineering/ design, permitting, and construction.

Coordination with Travis County

The intersections of Squirrel Hollow/Indian Point and Sesbania Drive are in Travis County. Although negotiations with the County will be necessary (we would expect that the County would provide funding for the intersections in their jurisdiction), the total cost to develop these intersections is included in the estimate provided below.

Timeline

It is estimated that the Preliminary Engineering Report and Public Involvement process can be completed in 12 months. Design and permitting should require another 24 months, and construction would require 12 months. The resulting total project time estimate is 48 months.

Cost Estimate

A preliminary cost estimate has been developed for this project. The estimate includes engineering, project management, construction costs, drainage modifications, water quality improvements, real estate acquisition, water & wastewater upgrades and modifications, and a 25% construction contingency. Including additional contingency for unknown issues including time and environmental stewardship it is estimated that the total cost for this project could total about $15,000,000.

Item	Cost
Brodie and Aspen Creek Roundabout	$550,000
Brodie and Squirrel Hollow / Indian Point Roundabout	$1,050,000
Brodie and Sesbania Drive Roundabout	$400,000
Brodie and Sunland Drive Roundabout	$450,000
Brodie and Gatling Gun Lane Roundabout	$500,000
Drainage Improvements for Roundabouts	$750,000
Water Quality for Roundabouts	$350,000
Extend SB merge area south of Slaughter - Turn Lane @ 300 LF	$75,000
Frate Barker to Sully Creek Shared Use Path @ 2400 LF	$250,000
Precast Median / Barrier Curb @ 2500 LF	$250,000
Misc. Utility Relocations (minus AWU) @ 5%	$231,250
Sub-Total Construction Estimate	**$4,856,250**
Construction Contingency @ 25%	$1,214,000
Grand Total Construction Estimate	**$6,070,500**
Construction Soft Costs @ 30%	$1,821,000
Preliminary Engineering Report	$350,000
Real Estate Acquisition for Roundabouts	$30,000
Real Estate Acquisition for Water Quality	$1,000,000
AWU Upgrades and Relocations	$3,000,000
Project Contingency @ 22%	$2,725,000
Grand Total	**$15,000,000**