
**Public Scoping Meeting and
Open House Summary
Comment and Response Report
for the MoPac South Environmental Study
held on Nov. 7, 2013**



MoPac South
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

MoPac South from
Cesar Chavez Street to Slaughter Lane
Travis County

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

FINAL: November 7, 2014





PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING AND OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY

Table of Contents

Open House Report.....	Page 1
Comment and Response Report.....	Page 7

List of Attachments

- Attachment A Legal Notices
- Attachment B Postcard and Electronic Newsletter
- Attachment C Additional Notices and Outreach
- Attachment D Display and Interactive Boards
- Attachment E Handout Materials
- Attachment F Photos
- Attachment G Registration Forms
- Attachment H Virtual Open House Web Page Analysis
- Attachment I Community Survey Forms
- Attachment J Comments (Forms, Web Mail and Verbal)
- Attachment K Court Reporter Transcript

Open House Summary

The Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority (Mobility Authority), in conjunction with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), held a public scoping meeting and open house event on Thursday, Nov. 7, 2013, at James Bowie High School, 4103 Slaughter Lane, Austin, TX 78749. The purpose of the event was to introduce the project from Cesar Chavez Street to Slaughter Lane and to gather public input on the purpose of and the need for the proposed improvements. Displays of the project location, the range of alternatives and other potential corridor enhancements were available among other displays for public review from 5:00 PM to 8:00 PM. A Virtual Open House was made available at www.MoPacSouth.com from Nov. 8 through Nov. 13, 2013. All of the handouts and meeting materials were available for download and review, and attendees were encouraged to provide their input online.

Study Summary

MoPac Expressway was constructed between 1973 and 2013 as a four to six lane divided highway. Over time, residential, retail and commercial development in the corridor has led to increased traffic congestion, negatively impacting mobility and quality of life for the traveling public and adjacent neighborhoods.

Recent studies show that the MoPac South corridor attracts approximately 174,000 vehicles per day (VPD) near Bee Cave Road and 45,000 VPD near Slaughter Lane. As a result, today's MoPac South peak hour traffic volumes from Cesar Chavez Street to Slaughter Lane create unreliable mobility.

The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.

The study is expected to take two to three years to complete.

Notices and Public Outreach

LEGAL NOTICES

Legal notices for the public scoping meeting and open house were published in the *Austin American-Statesman*, the primary newspaper in the region with an Oct. daily circulation of about 145,000, on Tuesday, Oct. 8, 2013, and Monday, Oct. 28, 2013.

Copies of the legal notices are provided in **Attachment A**.

POSTCARD INVITATION

Postcard invitations were mailed to 27,432 addresses in 25 post office carrier routes in the study area along the MoPac South corridor from Cesar Chavez Street in downtown Austin to Slaughter Lane in south Austin on Wednesday, Oct. 22, 2013.

Copies of the postcard are available in **Attachment B**.

ELECTRONIC NEWSLETTER

Two electronic newsletters were distributed between Oct. 31 and Nov. 14, 2013.

The first electronic newsletter was distributed to 619 people and organizations on Oct. 31 inviting them to attend the Nov. 7, 2013 public scoping meeting and open house. This newsletter was distributed to businesses, neighborhood associations, home owners' associations, individuals and community groups who had attended meetings, submitted business cards or requested verbally or online to receive the information.

A second electronic newsletter was distributed to 699 people on Nov. 14, 2013 inviting those who were not able to attend the public scoping meeting and open house to view the exhibits and submit input by Nov. 18 via the Virtual Open House. This distribution included additional email addresses submitted at community meetings and/or from those who requested updates verbally or online since the release of the Oct. 31 electronic newsletter.

Copies of the electronic newsletter are available in **Attachment B**.

ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATION/OUTREACH EFFORTS

- The Mobility Authority and TxDOT issued a media alert on November 6, 2013 to 74 media outlets and posted it on www.MobilityAuthority.com.
- Display advertisements were printed in five community newspapers: *Ahora Si!*, October 24, 2013; *Community Impact Southwest Edition*, October 24, 2013; *West Austin News*, October 24, 2013; *Oak Hill Gazette*, October 31, 2013; and, *Austin Chronicle*, November 1, 2013.

- The Mobility Authority sent out 98 letters to elected officials in a five-county region to inform them about the initiation of the environmental study and the November 7, 2013 public scoping meeting and open house. These letters also described an adjacent project, MoPac Intersections Environmental Study, and notified recipients of that study's open house on October 24, 2013.
- A notice of the meeting was distributed to 30 stakeholder groups and businesses. This notice was published in business and neighborhood community calendars in the weeks leading up to the event. The Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer Conservation District, Bike Austin, Shady Hollow, Save Our Springs, Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center, and the Circle C Home Owners Association, are some of the groups that published event information.
- The study team initiated discussions with 64 stakeholders representing 18 organizations beginning August 15, 2013 and ending October 17, 2013, to obtain input and get the word out about the public scoping meeting and open house. Below is a list of stakeholder meetings:
 1. Barton Creek Square Mall on August 15, 2013
 2. Bike Austin on August 16, 2013
 3. Downtown Austin Alliance on August 19, 2013
 4. Hill Country Conservancy on August 23, 2013
 5. The Trail Foundation on September 6, 2013
 6. Shady Hollow on September 9, 2013
 7. Circle C HOA on September 10, 2013
 8. Intel on September 11, 2013
 9. Oak Hill Association of Neighborhoods on September 11, 2013
 10. West Austin Neighborhood Group on September 19, 2013
 11. Old West Austin Neighborhood Association on September 20, 2013
 12. Capital Metro on September 19, 2013
 13. Save Barton Creek Association on September 23, 2013
 14. Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce on September 27, 2013
 15. Austin Area Research Organization on September 30, 2013
 16. LBJ Wildflower Center on October 14, 2013
 17. South Central Coalition of Neighborhood Associations on October 15, 2013
 18. Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer Conservation District on October 17, 2013
- The study team attended three community meetings to distribute information and invitations to the November 7, 2013 event: the SH 45SW Open House on

October 8, 2013, the Circle C HOA Food Trailer Night on October 18, 2013, and the Oak Hill Parkway Open House October 22, 2013.

Examples of the additional notification and outreach can be found in **Attachment C**.

Open House Information

OPEN HOUSE DATE, LOCATION, AND FORMAT

The Mobility Authority and TxDOT held the public scoping meeting and open house on Thursday, Nov. 7, 2013 at James Bowie High School, 4103 Slaughter Lane, Austin, TX 78749, in the cafeteria. The event was designed to be a casual, come-and-go format in an accessible location for the community. Hours were 5:00 PM to 8:00 PM.

Thirty-two directional signs were posted along Slaughter Lane from MoPac on the west side to Brodie Lane on the east side and on the high school grounds. The registration table was stationed next to the event entrance. Greeters guided visitors to the display area, which was located in a corridor behind the registration area. Study Team members waited at each of seven exhibit stations to assist people who wanted to view study information and participate in interactive displays.

Sticky notes and green dots were utilized as one of the methods to obtain feedback from attendees, who could post them directly onto the exhibits. A court reporter transcribed comments as well. Attendees were encouraged to fill out comment and survey forms and leave them in boxes stationed at the registration table and in the refreshments area. Study team members were available to provide information, assistance and answer questions.

The exhibits included:

- Welcome
- Why am I here?
- Study location map
- Anticipated timeline
- Agency partners
- What is the purpose of and need for mobility improvements along MoPac South?
- Range of alternatives
- Other potential corridor enhancements
- Environmental considerations
- Threatened and endangered species
- Air quality
- Water quality
- Context sensitive solutions

- Constraints map
- How to submit comments
- Next steps

Copies of the display and interactive boards can be found in **Attachment D**.

REGISTRATION AND HANDOUTS

Attendees were asked to sign in and were provided these handouts:

- Fact Sheet - MoPac South Environmental Study
- Comment Form
- Community Survey Form
- Sign Up for Updates Form
- Virtual Open House Flyer

Handout materials are included in **Attachment E**.

Photos of the public scoping meeting and open house are in **Attachment F**.

ATTENDANCE

One hundred and twenty people registered for the event. Registration forms are included in **Attachment G**.

VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE

The Mobility Authority launched a Virtual Open House at www.MoPacSouth.com. The Virtual Open House was made available from Nov. 8 through Nov. 18, 2013. The results included approximately 288 unique webpage views during this period. For the analysis of the data see **Attachment H**.

COMMUNITY SURVEY

One hundred and thirty people filled out community surveys. Sixty-two were completed at the public scoping meeting and open house and sixty-eight were submitted online. Community survey forms and results from the online survey are included in **Attachment I**.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The public comment period occurred from Oct. 8 through Nov. 18, 2013. During this time comments could be submitted by mail, online at www.MoPacSouth.com or by fax. Attendees at the open house were invited to leave their completed comment forms in boxes provided at the meeting and/or verbalize their comments to a court reporter. The deadline to receive comments was Nov. 18, 2013, at midnight.

Seventy people provided comments either at the event by filling out comment forms (30), online via Web Mail (36) or to a court reporter (4). No comments were received via fax or mail.

MAJOR THEMES

Many of the comments suggested adding lanes in a variety of forms (general purpose lanes, managed lanes, express lanes, toll lanes, HOV lanes, etc.). Roughly 10 percent of the comments recommended that MoPac be restriped to add more lanes and relieve congestion. Other comments suggested that the traffic signals at Slaughter Lane should be optimized. Several comments wanted improvements to ramps and weaving zones near Slaughter Lane, William Cannon Drive, US 290/SH 71 and Davis Lane. Some of the commenters suggested that mass transit options should be pursued to alleviate congestion along the corridor.

Some comments were against toll roads, although some expressed support if tolls are affordable.

Several comments did not want to see bicyclists and pedestrians on MoPac South, but many comments were favorable to the implementation of safe/separated bike and pedestrian trails like the Violet Crown Trail, to enable neighbors to safely cross MoPac South to places like the Veloway, LBJ Wildflower Center and Alamo Drafthouse.

Approximately 10 percent of comments favored the “do nothing” option. For those commenters that did not support the improvements, the main concern cited were potential impacts to the Edwards Aquifer. Other issues brought up included reduced property values, increased traffic noise, visual impacts and the potential for MoPac to be connected to SH 45SW in the future.

Comment Forms, Web Mail and Verbal Comments are available as **Attachment J** and Court Reporter Transcript is in **Attachment K**.

Comment and Response Report

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
1	Altai	Saad	Nov. 14, 2013	Web Mail	"All of the materials shown at the Nov. 7 Open House are available for you to download and review" Where to download? What website or link? "Virtual house open 8-18 Nov" Why was this info emailed late on Nov 14?	Questions about the virtual open house and timing of e-newsletter.	Comment noted. All materials were available at www.MoPacSouth.com from Nov. 8, 2013 through Nov. 18, 2014 (see Attachment B). Two electronic newsletters were sent out for the MoPac South Public Scoping Meeting and Open House, one on Oct. 31, 2013 and another on Nov. 14, 2013.
2	Andrade	Jason	Oct. 25, 2013	Web Mail	I would like to have underpasses at Slaughter and MoPac intersection and La Crosse and MoPac intersection.	Support for underpasses at Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue.	Comment noted. The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.
3	Ariza	Alex	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	Expand to a 3 rd lane from William Cannon bridge to Slaughter Lane. Add an extra lane in MoPac to have two exclusive lanes to turn left to Slaughter Lane and kept two lanes to go straight to MoPac. Let a nonstop turn to Davis Lane (Right) from MoPac just like it was done at northbound MoPac on 5 th street exit.	Expand lane from William Cannon Drive to Slaughter Lane. Need two dedicated left turn lanes onto Slaughter Lane. Need non-stop right turn to Davis Lane.	Comment noted. The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.
4	Artman	Scott	Nov. 05, 2013	Web Mail	I would like to see an additional northbound and southbound lane added to left of existing lanes between Slaughter and Cesar Chavez. I would also like to see overpasses added over Slaughter and La Crosse.	Additional lanes needed. Support for overpasses at Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue.	Comment noted. The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes. The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.
5	Ascot	Karin	Nov. 18, 2013	Web Mail	I am strongly opposed to adding lanes to MoPac. I do drive regularly on MoPac South; but I oppose adding lanes over the Edwards Aquifer. More lanes will simply attract more traffic in future: there is never an end to it. Building bigger roads will not solve our traffic problems. Destroying a vitally important water source to allow future residents of the Austin area to drive into town faster is not an acceptable trade-off.	Support for No-Build Alternative. Concern about impacts to Edwards Aquifer.	Comment noted. The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes. An assessment of potential environmental impacts including land use, socio economics, parks, cultural resources, soils, hazardous materials, vegetation, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, water resources, water quality (Edwards Aquifer), floodplains, traffic noise, air quality, visual and aesthetics resources is included as part of this study.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
6	Barnes	Bill	Oct. 25, 2013	Web Mail	<p>The current design of the intersections at Slaughter & MoPac and La Crosse & MoPac create significant traffic congestion due to poor traffic management.</p> <p>Traffic lights which control traffic on MoPac in the direction of heavy traffic during high commute periods are often very short duration and therefore do not relieve the backed up traffic. Recommendation is to eliminate the lights altogether and update the intersections to function similar to William Cannon & MoPac.</p> <p>Additional ideas for relieving congestion on South MoPac from Circle C to downtown Austin include light-rail service or "downtown direct" bus service with a suburban commuter station at the loading/unloading terminal (non-downtown).</p> <p>A middle HOV lane could also be constructed to flow in the direction of rush hour traffic and could be toll based.</p>	<p>Support for improvement to MoPac Intersections.</p> <p>Support for transit.</p> <p>Support for HOV lanes.</p> <p>Eliminate traffic lights.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p>
7	Bunch	Bill	Nov. 18, 2013	Web Mail	<p>Comments on Mopac South environmental study and in relation to the Nov. 2013 "open house" Submitted electronically on Nov. 18, 2013 by Save Our Springs Alliance Please accept the following comments on behalf of the Save Our Springs Alliance as part of the record for the Nov. 7 Open House on proposed improvements to South MoPac and as part of the record of early comments on the proposal. SOS Alliance is a nonprofit conservation organization with over 3000 members dedicated to the protection of the natural and cultural heritage of the Texas Hill Country region, including but not limited to, preventing air, water, land, noise, and light pollution, protecting public health and safety and property values, and preserving the Edwards Aquifer Ecosystem. We are numbering our comments so that they may be tracked more efficiently.</p> <p>1. The scale, context, and severity of adverse impacts on neighbors, commuters, and critical and vulnerable natural resources requires that a full Environmental Impact Statement be prepared. A "FONSI" is not possible on the proposal. "Take" of endangered species and diversion of public park and preserve land, at minimum for construction but likely for more than that, is unavoidable for the "build" alternatives.</p> <p>2. The proposed project is, in reality, one component of the tolled "loop" sought by the RMA. Segmenting the environmental analysis is not appropriate given that both the RMA and TxDOT are pursuing simultaneously the "Mopac Intersections" and 45SW projects. An EIS, whether considered "programmatic" or otherwise, should encompass</p>	<p>An EIS is required.</p> <p>MoPac South is one part of a larger project.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>1. In accordance with federal regulations, when the significance of impacts of a transportation project proposal is uncertain, an environmental assessment (EA) is prepared to assist in making this determination (40 CFR 1508.9). The Mobility Authority and TxDOT have received approval from the Federal Highway Administration to classify the MoPac South environmental document as an EA. Proposed improvements involve added capacity on an existing highway. Some (minimal) additional ROW may be required; no displacements are anticipated. Although the significance of social, economic and environmental impacts is uncertain at this time, it is anticipated that a significant impact would not occur. An Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared if significant impacts are discovered.</p> <p>2. The Mobility Authority and TxDOT are working together to conduct environmental studies on several projects, including MoPac South, MoPac Intersections and SH 45SW. Each of these projects is included as a stand-alone project in the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's (CAMPO) 2035 Plan, and as such, is being studied separately.</p> <p>In addition, each of these projects has independent utility, meaning each would benefit drivers and would be considered a reasonable expenditure, even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made; therefore they are being studied independent of one another. If built, these projects could function as stand-alone improvements, even if other improvements in the area do not advance, or advance at a different schedule.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
7, cont.	Bunch	Bill	Nov. 18, 2013	Web Mail	<p>Mopac and 45 SW from Cesar Chavez on the northwest to Interstate 35 on the southeast. This analysis would include, but not be limited to, the conversion of South Mopac from a local commuter highway into a full blown "Interstate 35 West" component in a regional and national freeway system.</p> <p>3. The analysis must include "induced traffic" that will flow from the project as defined and from the larger project that is being pursued (the 45SW and "MoPac intersections" improvements). This "induced traffic" includes but may not be limited to (a) additional commuter traffic from new growth in far southwest Travis and northern Hays counties (north east, north central, and northwest) encouraged by expanding the freeway; (b) additional driving by existing residents who currently drive less or take alternate routes, (c) new traffic diverted from I-35/US 183, Manchaca/Lamar, FM 1626, Brodie, South First, and South Congress.</p> <p>4. The analysis should include a detailed analysis of travel delay during the construction period. The "sales pitch" included in the Open House refers to estimated travel delay of current MoPac commuters (282,000 hours per mile per year) but this is for US 290 north to US 183, not Cesar Chavez to Slaughter Lane. The transportation literature is replete with modeling tools and after the fact analysis of where projected claims in reduced travel times (reduced congestion) failed to materialize and never made up for the travel delays caused by construction of the project.</p> <p>5. The project analysis should disclose to some degree of detail on the three-dimensional geometry of the interchange at Cesar Chavez and on necessary expansion of the bridges across Town Lake and the Barton Creek Greenbelt. TxDOT should also disclose all reports from construction of the existing Mopac lanes on caves, voids or other environmental hazards encountered during construction of the existing facility.</p> <p>6. The addition of two lanes in each direction (total of four lanes) could add up to 45 to 50 acres of additional impervious cover over the recharge zone of the Barton Springs Edwards Aquifer. This aquifer has been determined by the TCEQ as more vulnerable to pollution than any other major drinking water aquifer in Texas. Project proponents should, at a minimum, commit to purchasing ten acres of recharge zone mitigation land for every one acre of additional impervious cover placed on the recharge zone.</p> <p>7. Project sponsors should research and summarize for the general public the current literature on health risks to persons living, attending school, and recovering in hospitals near a freeway of the scale proposed. Similarly, proponents should analyze and summarize potential harm to the health of the many hundreds of thousands of people who walk, bike, and run on the Town Lake Trail Mopac pedestrian bridge. If this impact is significant, the project budget should include a new pedestrian bridge located a safe (or safer) distance from the project.</p>	<p>Analysis should include induced traffic.</p> <p>Analysis should include travel delay during construction.</p> <p>A geometric schematic is needed.</p> <p>All reports related to caves, voids or other environmental hazards encountered during construction should be disclosed.</p> <p>Project should purchase mitigation land over recharge zone.</p> <p>Environmental document should disclose health risks associated with living close to a freeway.</p>	<p>Comment 7, Continued</p> <p>3. The traffic analysis and indirect and cumulative impact analysis will assume all projects listed in the CAMPO 2035 Plan have been constructed.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. After a Preferred Alternative is identified, a geometric schematic will be prepared and presented to the public, including all required construction elements within the Cesar Chavez Street interchange, if any.</p> <p>In accordance with the Edwards Aquifer Rules, if a void is encountered in the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone during construction, it will be reported to TCEQ and a closure plan will be developed and submitted to TCEQ.</p> <p>6. Any improvements to MoPac South will be in accordance with the Edwards Aquifer Rules.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
7, cont.	Bunch	Bill	Nov. 18, 2013	Web Mail	<p>8. The EIS should analyze improvements on Mopac limited to Cesar Chavez to either Loop 360 South or US 290/SH 71, with an interchange upgrade at either 290/71 or Loop 360 as providing an alternative to the sought after South Mopac/SH 45SW loop that the current project proposal seeks to advance.</p> <p>9. The draft EIS should fully disclose an initial estimate of the amount of cut and fill required to construct each alternative, together with a meaningful analysis of the likely construction phase impacts of sediment and other pollution entering the Barton Springs Edwards Aquifer and flowing to Barton Springs and designated Critical Habitat for the endangered Austin blind salamander. Harm (sufficient to result in legal "take") to listed endangered species is inevitable as a result of construction impacts alone.</p> <p>10. In assessing the actual "need" for the project, TxDOT and the RMA should rely on relevant congestion data, not data limited to north of US 290 or extending all the way to 183 north, unless the full scope of the project is acknowledged., in which case the traffic counts and related congestion, trip generation, etc data should be</p> <p>11. All consultant reports that feed into the EA/EIS process, together with relevant databases relied upon, should be posted on the website as soon as they are completed, rather than withheld on only made available upon formal information request. Since taxpayers are paying for the information, it should be benefit all interested parties, not just the project proponents.</p> <p>12. The cumulative effects analysis should include, at minimum, (a) indirect effects from new development spurred by the project, (b) (if the project scope stays as it is) the MoPac intersections, 45SW, Oak Hill "Y" and 290/71W expansions, together with proposals from Hays County and others to extend and expand large-scale water lines to the 1826, 1626, 290, and Hamilton Pool Road corridors.</p> <p>13. Traffic projections should consider a range of projections rather than just a single set of traffic numbers for future years, such that the effects of recent trends and new technology are captured in at least one projection scenario. For example, the projections should evaluate increasing smartphone enhanced rideshare; driverless car and driver-assisted technologies; increasing telecommuting; the saturation of women in the work force; demographic trends showing reduced driving by younger generations; the implementation of regional bus transit.</p>	<p>Environmental document should analyze an alternative connection to the proposed SH 45SW.</p> <p>Environmental document should disclose initial estimate of cut and fill.</p> <p>Project should rely on relevant congestion data.</p> <p>All reports associated with the project should be posted to the website.</p> <p>The cumulative effects analysis should include new development spurred by other projects.</p> <p>Traffic projections should consider a range of projections.</p>	<p>Comment 7, Continued</p> <p>8. The MoPac South Environmental Study is considering improvements to MoPac from Cesar Chavez Street to Slaughter Lane, which includes improvements to the US 290 and Loop 360 interchanges.</p> <p>9. The MoPac South Environmental Study will document potential construction impacts and identify any required mitigation and/or preventative measures during construction, such as a Water Pollution Abatement Plan and a Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit. The Mobility Authority and TxDOT will work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding any potential impacts to endangered species.</p> <p>10. As the study progresses, more detailed traffic data will be generated and presented at future public meetings.</p> <p>11. The Draft Environmental Assessment will identify sources of information regarding all surveys and investigations. Final technical reports developed for use in the Environmental Assessment will be publicly available via www.MoPac South.com, and will be appended to the Environmental Assessment. Draft versions of technical reports are subject to revision and will be released to the public as these revisions are completed and final versions are approved.</p> <p>12. The Environmental Assessment will include an analysis of indirect and cumulative impacts in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act using TxDOT and FHWA guidance.</p> <p>13. The best available regional planning information will be incorporated into the traffic analysis for the project.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
7, cont.	Bunch	Bill	Nov. 18, 2013	Web Mail	<p>14. At least one option evaluated in the EA/EIS process should be a “shared solutions” option that is different from “no build” in that includes a combination of actions that, taken together, serve the purpose of reducing travel delays by local commuters. This “shared” approach would include, for example, (a) expanded public transit on Mopac, (b) subsidized “rideshare,” (c) enhanced telecommuting, carpooling, and flex-time by major employers, and (d) upgrades to the I-35 corridor and other parallel roadways located between I-35 and South Mopac.</p> <p>15. The draft EA/EIS should include a rough estimate of costs of construction of the various alternatives, with particular attention to the likely (very large) costs for bridge expansions over Town Lake and the Barton Creek Greenbelt.</p> <p>16. The draft and final environmental documents should specifically analyze the effects of the alternatives on climate and greenhouse gas emissions. This analysis should include “embedded” costs in all materials and machinery used in the construction phase, as well as the additional “induced” driving (and thus increased emissions) and exurban development spurred by the project.</p> <p>17. Air, noise and light pollution impact analyses should include effects on schools (including Austin High) parks and preserve lands.</p> <p>18. If the “baseline” effects analysis assumes that the current water quality controls on MoPac south of US 290 are dysfunctional, then TxDOT should explain why they are dysfunctional and why any new controls would not be similarly neglected and dysfunctional. If TxDOT believes the current controls are functioning, then they should provide data to support this claim.</p>	<p>Environmental document should evaluate a shared solution.</p> <p>Environmental document should disclose costs of alternatives.</p> <p>Environmental document should analyze the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Environmental document should analyze effects on schools related to air, noise and light pollution.</p> <p>Environmental document should evaluate the existing water quality controls on MoPac.</p>	<p>Comment 7, Continued.</p> <p>14. A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) alternative is being evaluated. The TDM alternative will include an evaluation of demand management strategies such as rideshare programs, telecommuting programs, car pool programs and other strategies.</p> <p>15. The Environmental Assessment will include a cost estimate for the Preferred Alternative. This estimate will include all required bridge work.</p> <p>16. Comment noted.</p> <p>17. An Air Quality and Traffic Noise Analysis will be conducted in accordance with TxDOT and FHWA guidance. All highway illumination will be designed to conform with the latest edition of the TxDOT <i>Highway Illumination Manual</i>. Analyses will be conducted to determine the warrant and extent of continuous illumination and safety lighting along ramps and at intersections. The decision-making procedures that govern highway illumination in Texas do contain provisions for addressing sky glow and light trespass issues, including consideration for alternative luminaires (e.g. LED) and glare shields.</p> <p>18. Comment noted.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
8	Chernow	Laureen	Nov. 17, 2013	Web Mail	<p>The intersections of Slaughter Lane and William Cannon at MoPac need to be improved and streamlined.</p> <p>Additional lanes are needed between Slaughter and Cesar Chavez.</p> <p>If those lanes are tolled, please make the tolls affordable to the people who drive them every day. I believe some of the failures w 130 are due to the excessive toll charges.</p> <p>I would like to have below-ground intersection access considered where possible and native vegetation used as noise/view screens and for removing pollution from the air.</p> <p>The most advanced technology to capture runoff should be used.</p>	<p>Support for underpasses.</p> <p>Additional lanes needed.</p> <p>Runoff should be captured.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>The LBJ Wildflower Center's Ecosystem Design Group is a member of the MoPac South Study Team. They will evaluate the current level of ecosystem function along the corridor and then make recommendations on areas in which to preserve, restore or enhance ecosystem function. They will also suggest appropriate, plant based, storm water management strategies to enhance hydrologic function.</p>
9	Cintula	Cliff	Nov. 12, 2013	Web Mail	<p>Please provide grade-separated bike lanes for the length of any new road project. Any gov't sponsored project should include this type of infrastructure from now on. Today, there is no safe place to cross the greenbelt, or even ben white. The city of Austin and CTRMA can do much better!</p>	<p>Support for grade-separated bike lanes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p>
10	Corum	Claudia	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>There is indeed a problem in the south MoPac corridor. The first "solution" is to <u>NOT</u> add more traffic with SH 45SW.</p> <p>1st- improve access and flow at Slaughter. No need (for overpasses at La Crosse). Underpass with increased on/off ramps to handle East West flow onto MoPac from Slaughter. 2nd, some sort of managed lane on MoPac from Slaughter to Cesar Chavez.</p> <p>Possibly a new dedicated lane one-way N-S depending on time of day, / improve access to Manchaca for Hays Co. drivers – make them pay for it.</p>	<p>Support No-Build Alternative on SH 45SW.</p> <p>Support for underpass at Slaughter Lane and No-Build Alternative at La Crosse Avenue.</p> <p>Support for reversible lanes and managed lanes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>SH 45SW is being considered under a separate study, please visit www.sh45sw.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the SH 45SW Study Team.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>Reversible lanes will be evaluated in the range of alternatives.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
11	Cotera	Matha P.	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Need bridge over Barton Skyway to connect S. Lamar to MoPac</p> <p>Need public transit plan from downtown to far south Austin along MoPac south.</p> <p>Need integrated bike/ pedestrian facilities in various areas of the corridor.</p>	<p>Need bridge at Barton Skyway connecting Lamar Blvd. to MoPac.</p> <p>Support for transit.</p> <p>Support for bike and pedestrian facilities.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>An extension of Barton Skyway to South Lamar is outside the scope of this study.</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p>
12	Davis	Frances	Oct. 24, 2013	Web Mail	<p>If you do not do the 45 extension, you have done nothing long term for traffic. It appears either way you are moving the entry way from Slaughter to La Crosse for Circle C residents. This is not acceptable. Why? Because it is too close to Kiker Elementary School. You are putting a Band-Aid on something that needs a better solution.</p> <p>If you extend the road on the east side of Davis lane to make it bigger to funnel some of the Shady Hollow, Cherry Creek (Brodie) and Sendera subdivisions it may make a difference and it seems a bit cheaper.</p> <p>Also, extending a 4th lane at MoPac into Slaughter west might also work since some commuters are already doing that.</p> <p>Working on the traffic heading east on Slaughter is the bigger problem. 45 would help this it would funnel the Buda/Kyle traffic straight to their area and bringing those people who live from Sendera to Kyle home faster. Dealing with 45 with exits allowing traffic to exit into 1626 to 35 seems to be the future for us. The sooner we come to the realization that this would help all those to take slaughter the better. An underpass that can attach to a new 45 to 35 is the best solution.</p>	<p>Support for Build Alternative on SH 45SW.</p> <p>Need improvements near Davis Lane.</p> <p>Need dedicated turn lane onto Slaughter Lane.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>SH 45SW is being considered under a separate study, please visit www.sh45sw.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the SH 45SW Study Team.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
13	Derrick	Ann	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Build right-hand turn lane to Slaughter from MoPac that goes back much further (north) than it presently does.</p> <p>This will syphon off more cars and allow smoother flow across intersection.</p> <p>Not a fan of ped/bike lanes along a high speed road! So many people have died and been injured along 360.</p>	<p>Need extended right turn lane at Slaughter Lane.</p> <p>Bikes and pedestrians on MoPac are not safe.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p>
14	Derrick	John	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>I am aware that this event is only for MoPac to Cesar Chavez but the congestion problem exists from TX45 and the "Y" at Oak Hill.</p> <p>It would only make sense to do this project if it was part of a larger plan.</p>	<p>Support for Build Alternative on SH 45SW and Oak Hill Parkway.</p> <p>These projects should be part of a larger plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>SH 45SW is being considered under a separate study, please visit www.sh45sw.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the SH 45SW Study Team.</p> <p>Improvements to the "Y" or Oak Hill Parkway are being considered under a separate study, please visit www.oakhillparkway.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the Oak Hill Parkway Team.</p> <p>MoPac South, SH 45SW and Oak Hill Parkway are all included in the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Regional Transportation Plan, CAMPO 2035 Plan. Please visit www.campotexas.org/plans-programs/campo-plan-2035/ for more information.</p>
15	Dittmar	Stephanie	Oct. 25, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I do not want to see approval of a highway construction project that will connect 45 to allow more Hayes County drivers to use it. Not only will the additional traffic negatively impact this environmentally sensitive area, just the construction could do damage. I do realize that there are already traffic issues in this area, but with all of the challenges that we are having right now with water shortages, to be considering something to add to that burden is distressing to me. I am not even happy about the additional home construction that is going on this area. When we moved here 12 years ago, I had no clue that Circle C itself was an environmental controversy at one time, we just were looking at schools for our kids and where houses were available. I would not have moved here had I known, but then we weren't having the water issues like we are now either.</p>	<p>Opposed to a connection of SH 45SW and MoPac.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac South Environmental Study is independent and considering improvements from Cesar Chavez Street to Slaughter Lane only. It does not connect to the proposed SH 45SW.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
16	Esparza	Manuel	Nov. 03, 2013	Web Mail	Thank you for sharing the study online. I have reviewed it in detail and my comment is to proceed with the plan to have MoPac go under the Slaughter and La Crosse intersections. I believe that this is a much safer option, especially when it tends to ice over since the speed over the overpass will be much lower by cross traffic instead of the MoPac traffic. I strongly support either option though and do not agree with the "Do Nothing" option as these two intersections are a very large problem that contributes to long delays and loss of productivity.	Support for underpasses at Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue.	Comment noted. The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.
17	Esparza III	Manuel	Nov. 14, 2013	Web Mail	My feedback is that the capacity of MoPac must be increased. Many people already are taking alternate routes which shows in the big difference between the Bee Caves volume and the Slaughter Volume. Many take routes through the neighborhoods crossing Slaughter and/or William Cannon and getting on MoPac much further North. Many take 1826 to 290 and maybe up to Southwest Parkway to catch MoPac that way. I would support the "express" lanes provided that can really make a difference followed by "additional" dedicated general purpose lanes. We should be serious about addressing the bottlenecks because adding capacity is good but would be diminished if the bottlenecks in the tough road design areas aren't fully addressed. Let's be creative and bold about solving these problems.	Support for additional express and/or general purpose lanes.	Comment noted. The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.
18	Ewig	Susan	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	I would like to see mass-transit options considered, specifically rail options. The goal ought to be to move more people up and down MoPac rather than trying to move more cars. I don't believe people will carpool enough to make HOV lanes a viable option. However, clean, fast trains with just a few stations along MoPac need to be part of our future plans. Especially if we are to keep the beauty of Austin. Nobody wants Austin to become a mini-Houston.	Support for rail. HOV lanes will not solve the problem.	Comment noted. Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information. The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
19	Fedrick	John	Nov. 07, 2013	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comments	<p>My name is John. I live in Circle C down in -- by Slaughter and MoPac by the Wildflower Center. And I drive in traffic going northbound/southbound MoPac a lot, which gives me a lot of time to sit and try and think of some ideas that would help us all through the traffic.</p> <p>Just a couple of things I noticed and hopefully they'll prove helpful to you is going north on MoPac, when you come up to Davis Lane, I noticed there's a bunch of congestion right there at Davis Lane where people are trying to enter northbound MoPac from Davis Lane. And then the people that are already on MoPac going north kind of jumble together and there -- it causes a lot of confusion, which causes a lot of delays. One thing I did notice was that there's already pavement already laid out. And if we could re-stripe those -- that pavement into three lanes, it would be extremely helpful, especially if the people that are trying to get on from Davis Lane could enter onto their own lane and then just keep on going through. And the other two lanes could continue parallel with them. So in other words, if you could re-stripe it -- if you could re-stripe it to let those two lanes going north -- add that third lane, I think it will help with that confusion. And it will also help not only during traffic times but also during times of no traffic.</p> <p>The other day I was driving northbound and there was a little old lady driving her husband, I guess, to the doctor or something like that. And she was going 50 miles an hour. And there was only one other lane to try and get around her. Well, there was some other guy -- I don't know. He must have, you know, not been thinking. He was driving about 55. So there was no way to get around both of them. So, you know, people just backed up behind them. And there was no reason. There was no -- you know, it wasn't a peak hour and there wasn't a lot of traffic on the road. But that third lane would definitely help out. So, you know, it could allow us to get around. One thing I did notice is a lot of ---another thing I did notice was there's a lot of people exiting William Cannon. And when they do that, they always slow down to, you know, 55, 60 miles an hour. But there are only two lanes and you can't get around them. So if you just -- if you add three lanes, then those people can slow down. "Okay. I'm going to exit William Cannon." You know, they're already thinking I'm already here. And then the other people that are trying to go north can get past them and get on down the road.</p> <p>Another thing I noticed -- I notice a lot of things because I sit in a lot of traffic. When you're going southbound on MoPac, we really appreciate the flyover that TxDOT built. It's been absolutely amazing going from 290 to MoPac southbound. My wife and I were just extremely pleased when that opened up. And we were -- when we drove on, we were just, you know, singing praises.</p>	<p>Restripe MoPac lanes near Davis Lane to accommodate another lane.</p> <p>Pleased with direct connectors at US 290.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
19, cont.	Fedrick	John	Nov. 07, 2013	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comments	<p>And -- but we noticed that when you come off of that flyover, a bunch of traffic southbound gets really congested because people are trying to go from southbound MoPac over to William Cannon. And then the people going southbound 290 are trying to get on MoPac. So it gets real combusted right there and causes a huge traffic jam. I was looking going southbound and it seems like it would be possible to put a lane underneath the flyover that goes from MoPac southbound to the access road and label it William Cannon Exit. So all those people that are trying to go southbound on MoPac can exit and get over to the access road. And the people that are going southbound from the 290 flyover can get over and won't have to fight that traffic because it will alleviate that with all the William Cannon people that go through. It's a really tight fit. And you'd definitely have to get some engineers. I'm not sure. I don't build highways. But it seems that it would be possible to add -- put an exit lane right there.</p> <p>And my last idea -- I'm sure our nice court reporter is thanking me very much for stopping sometime soon -- but would be to continue -- to add a third lane south of William Cannon going southbound on MoPac. We already have some of that pavement up there, especially already for most of the bridges going all the way -- on the bridges for sure all the way to Davis Lane. There are only certain spots on the -- on the southbound MoPac where we would have to pave. And that would be after the bridge at the Kincheon Branch. There's a little creek that the bridge goes on. And there's a short strip that, according to my map that I drew -- you guys are probably making a lot of fun of me right now. But on the map I drew, it's less than a quarter acre that goes from one shoulder to the next shoulder that we could pave. That could create a third lane, which would help traffic go south a lot easier. Then after that, there's a longer stretch of lane.</p> <p>I didn't get the map out to see exactly how far the square foot is. But if we could just add a third lane going to Davis, then the people could exit Davis that need to go to Davis. And then the people going southbound can just boogie on down the road. It doesn't seem like it really needs to be -- add -- like add another lane right now, for interim use at least, to Slaughter. Because I'm sure the grand idea is, you know, in the future to build hopefully an underpass at Slaughter where MoPac will go underneath Slaughter. But that's going to be a whole other, you know, project. I'm sure that's going to be down the road. But if we could just have those improvements done up to Davis, then, you know, we can focus all the financial monetary means that we need to use to work on the southbound MoPac intersection at Slaughter.</p>	<p>Add additional lane to exit on William Cannon Drive and continue it south toward Davis Lane.</p> <p>Support for underpass at Slaughter Lane.</p>	<p>Comment 19, Continued.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
19, cont.	Fedrick	John	Nov. 07, 2013	Court Reporter/	And just -- it seems like these improvements wouldn't cost that much money, especially the re-striping going northbound. It just seems like that's just paint. You know, I mean, if you want me, on the weekend, I'll -- me and my buddies will go up there. And, you know, we can get some paint and we'll paint it. It'll be no problem. We won't even charge you. We'll just be happy to go northbound on MoPac in a third lane. And then going southbound, it just seems like it wouldn't be that expensive. I do some commercial real estate appraisal and we use Marshall Valuation System to appraise to value what it costs to lay asphalt. And the Marshall Valuation says it's generally about \$5 a square foot to pave. You know, me just putting these numbers together, it -- I mean, even if you double that at \$10 a square foot, the areas that would create a third lane using the existing pavement that we already have, it seems like it'd just be minimal compared to, you know, the millions of dollars that we're going to spend later on down the road on Slaughter, which we really need. So I'm going to stop now because my poor court reporter looks like her fingers are going to break. But I really appreciate you listening to me babble for so long and I hope you have a good day.	Comment 19, Continued.	Comment 19, Continued.
20	Fedrick	John	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	Please, please, please restripe MoPac northbound after Davis Lane to include three lanes. Two lanes will keep congestion at that intersection. It is cheap, too. Just need paint. Please pave spots along MoPac southbound to allow for three lanes to Davis Lane. This will speed up traffic going southbound. (pictures were attached to this comment)	Restripe MoPac lanes near Davis Lane to accommodate another lane.	Comment noted. One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.
21	Feicht	Doug	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	I prefer to address management of existing roadway/lanes at exits and entrances. To eliminate merges close southbound ramp at Bee Caves continues past Barton Skyway. Correct 290 southbound flyover – merge with frontage ramp before hitting MoPac. If not enough room, close frontage ramp southbound. Open 3 rd lane (inside) to Davis on existing* pavement. * well, 3 sections of shoulder on grade need to be added This will create dedicated exit lane at Davis and 2 southbound. Northbound open 3 rd lane from Davis to William cannon- restripe existing pavement, this will create dedicated entrance lane for Davis. Groove “S turn” to reduce “spinout” accidents and backups. It's time to build the bridge at Slaughter.	Eliminate merge close to Bee Cave Road. Resolve merge issue south of US 290. Restripe to accommodate additional lane between William Cannon Drive and Davis Lane. Support for overpass at Slaughter Lane.	Comment noted. One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes. The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas. The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
22	Ficke	Taryn	Nov. 07, 2013	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comments	<p>So the first question is what are the biggest issues facing the MoPac South corridor and clearly traffic, congestion, mobility in general is a big issue. The fact that there are so many cars on MoPac at this point in time, MoPac South, particularly backing up from Slaughter Lane all the way -- well, all the way to 183 North, is a problem for those of us that live in the area.</p> <p>My biggest concern -- number two is what are the biggest concerns. There are areas that I would say aren't very safe as a result of all of -- all of the cars that are there now, specifically at where MoPac and 290 intersect. And if you're going south, you have three lanes that are all trying to weave in that area where the 290 -- 290 direct connect to MoPac South is. People stop. People slam on their brakes. They're trying to weave over. And it's pretty much a big mess in the afternoon.</p> <p>And the next section is, "Please let us know how you agree or disagree with the following statements."</p> <p>"Traffic congestion in the MoPac South Corridor is a serious problem." I strongly agree.</p> <p>"There is a need to better manage traffic in the MoPac South Corridor." I strongly agree.</p> <p>"There is a need to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety in the MoPac South Corridor." Well, my opinion is bicycles should be not allowed on the MoPac South corridor. And I think they're taking their life into their hands every day when they get on there. Freeways at anything -- any road above 45 miles an hour should not have bicycles or pedestrians allowed on it to use as a recreational tool.</p> <p>"D" is, "There is a need to improve access to public transit service in the MoPac South Corridor." Well, that's an interesting question. I don't know how many people who live south would actually use a public transit service. But I would think that Capital Metro should be consulted on this issue. They have a 171 bus that leaves Oak Hill. They also have buses that go up and down Congress and 1st. And all of those would have -- I mean, if they were going to extend those further south, I would think it would depend on the ridership of the buses that they currently have before that question is answered. I wouldn't want a bus or a light-rail system coming to South Austin unless it's actually warranted.</p> <p>"E," "A goal of any proposed improvement should be to manage congestion." I believe that that I strongly agree. That is true.</p>	<p>Concern for safety near US 290 and MoPac.</p> <p>No bikes on MoPac.</p> <p>Support for better traffic management on MoPac South.</p> <p>Consult with Capital Metro.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p> <p>The Mobility Authority and TxDOT are working with Capital Metro regarding the accommodation of transit on MoPac South. They have also met with neighborhoods along MoPac South.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
22, cont.	Ficke	Taryn	Nov. 07, 2013	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comments	<p>"A goal of any proposed improvement should be to improve response times for emergency vehicles." Yes, I believe that is true also. And there are areas along MoPac that if there was a wider shoulder, the emergency vehicles would be able to get by much easier. It will be interesting once North MoPac is done to see just how much trouble there's going to be with emergency vehicles once there are literally no shoulders. So I wouldn't want to see that in South Austin.</p> <p>"Do you use current pedestrian/bicycle facilities?" No. I choose to live.</p> <p>"Are there" -- not opinionated, am I? "Are there specific environmental constraints or community constraints, cemeteries, parks, etc., you're aware of that should be considered in the MoPac South Corridor?" To the best of my knowledge, no, other than if they encounter a large cave that would turn the project into too costly of a measure to do.</p> <p>"What groups, organizations, or individuals should study -- should the study team talk with to get additional information for the MoPac South Environmental Study?" Well, clearly they need to talk to Capital Metro about whether it would be warranted to try to move people in large groups. They need to meet with the neighborhood associations because in Austin, we all know they rule. Circle C will probably be a large influence because their traffic leaving is -- there is a lot of congestion leaving Circle C. But yet I imagine there will be those that will not want improvements. I think that's the end.</p> <p>"A goal of any proposed improvement should be to protect the environment." I agree with that. But at what price? If some environmental features can be mitigated in other areas, that would suffice. If you're going to tell me I can't have a road at all because there's a karst feature right there, my suggestion is to do something about the karst feature and the road should go in. Because if we completely plan around that in South Austin, nothing is ever going to happen and our problem is never going to be solved.</p> <p>"I," "A goal of any proposed improvement should be about moving more people, not just more vehicles." In theory, I agree with that. Not strongly agree, but just agree in theory. However, us Texans really like our cars.</p> <p>And if you think or if any government agency thinks that by putting in a light-rail or -- Capital Metro already offers carpools. They'll let you have a van and you and your friends can carpool to work. It's going to be hard to move those people from Dripping Springs into Austin on any rail system or any bus system because timing, if nothing else. I tried to take -- I tried to take mass transit when I went to UT and it was virtually impossible because the times weren't right. And people who have their kids, they're not going to go and get on a bus to go to work and not be able to pick their children up.</p> <p>All right.●●Number 4, "Do you sometimes avoid the MoPac South Corridor because of traffic?" No. Although I want to.</p>	Comment 22, Continued.	Comment 22, Continued.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
23	Gassman	Joe	Nov. 14, 2013	Web Mail	<p>We live in the Circle C area and use the MoPac south corridor daily. I welcome any solution whose highest priority is congestion relief. However, any solution should also strike a practical balance of cost and environmental impact, including water quality. Bonus points will be awarded if the final solution also includes improved access to public transit from Circle C to downtown. These bonus points will quadruple if this includes an extension of the light rail to Circle C. I'm sure timing makes a significant difference, but I see a greater amount a severity of problems on my way home in the evenings (southbound) than in the mornings. The four issues that strike me as the most congestive and dangerous are:</p> <p>Merge of traffic from 5th/6th and Cesar Chavez onto MoPac South. Actually, the merge with MoPac south is reasonable, but the merge of the 5th/6th with Cesar Chavez is far too short with poor visibility to allow efficient merges. It's a constant rear-ending risk area.</p> <p>Merge of 290 and the interchange for William Cannon. There's a large amount of traffic that is trying to trade places here, with a very short distance in which to do it.</p> <p>Reduction of 3 lanes down to 2 just south of the William Cannon interchange. People wait until the last minute to get over (due to either a lack of proper attention or courtesy). This creates a lot of rapid braking and apprehension, which fouls up any chances for an efficient flow of traffic.</p> <p>The exit for Davis. This needs to be a dedicated exit lane and not just an exit turn off to allow a smoother flow of traffic with less rapid braking and aggressive merging. Thanks.</p>	<p>Support for improvements to MoPac South near Circle C.</p> <p>Support for transit and rail.</p> <p>Merging of 5th/6th Street with Cesar Chavez needs to be extended for smooth transition.</p> <p>Davis Lane needs a dedicated exit lane.</p> <p>Solution should balance cost and environmental impacts.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.</p> <p>An assessment of potential environmental impacts including land use, socio economics, parks, cultural resources, soils, hazardous materials, vegetation, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, water resources, water quality (Edwards Aquifer), floodplains, traffic noise, air quality, visual and aesthetics resources is included as part of this study.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
24	Gatlin	Emily	Nov. 06, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I am in strong agreement that something needs to be done to the Slaughter and MoPac intersection. I use the intersection to mostly to travel from my neighborhood (Deer Haven near where Deer Lane and Davis Lane intersect) to the retail and restaurants in the Circle C area.</p> <p>I use the Davis Lane exit off MoPac to get to my house, but evening rush hour congestion is so bad at Slaughter that it delays access to the Davis Lane exit, which is a couple miles north. In addition, it causes too many people to use Davis Lane as a cut-through to avoid the traffic, which adds more traffic (a lot of whom speed) to my neighborhood. We also get a lot of traffic that tries to cut through my neighborhood, particularly on Ovilla Drive, and on the street we live on. Ovilla is not a through street so they end of doubling back to Davis, but again, unnecessary. My point is that the problem is bleeding into the surrounding neighborhoods.</p> <p>I am strongly opposed, however, to an overpass at Slaughter and MoPac. One of the most attractive parts of living in this area is the natural beauty, and I believe an overpass would destroy that. I also want to feel connected to the neighborhood resources on the other side of MoPac, and the physical barrier of an overpass impedes that. An underpass would very likely be a better alternative.</p> <p>I would also really like to see some vast improvements to the ability to walk/bike from my 'hood east of MoPac to Alamo Draffhouse, TCBY, Coffee Bean, etc. Right now, I feel it's too dangerous, especially with kids. I believe the potentially new Violet Crown hike and bike trail will provide that opportunity, but I'm not sure if it will be lighted for use after dark. And of course, that's contingent on it ever being built. We bought our house about 2 years ago and plan to live in it for many years to come (20+), so I plan to stay up to date and involved in any public comments regarding this area. Thank you for your consideration</p>	<p>Support for underpass at Slaughter Lane.</p> <p>Reduce cut-through traffic coming from Davis Lane.</p> <p>Support for bike/pedestrian facilities east of MoPac.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p>
25	Gerson	Steve	Nov. 05, 2013	Web Mail	<p>When I first saw the headline that said something about "toll lanes" and "IH35", I didn't bother reading the article because I thought what great idea it was to take the underutilized Texas 130 toll road and convert that to IH35. We should be paying people to take the 130 bypass around the city instead of charging them money for that.</p> <p>Then I heard that the real plan was to put toll roads on MoPac in an attempt to fast track IH35 drivers. Sounds like a crazy bad idea to route IH35 traffic onto an already crowded MoPac. So what about the idea of turning 130 into a "free" highway and calling it IH35. The part of 130 from Creedmore to I10 could remain tolled.</p>	<p>Do not route IH-35 traffic onto MoPac.</p> <p>Convert SH 130 to IH-35.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>Improvements to IH-35 and SH 130 are outside the scope of this study.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
26	Goodwin	Vikki	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>While I agree that the mobility plan should include some mass transit, I know that the vast majority of area residents will continue to use their own cars to get around.</p> <p>Road improvements should take priority and a cost-benefit analysis should be conducted for rail due to its extreme cost per capita. Educate residents about the best engineering plan- don't let individuals dictate what should be done.</p>	Support for transit, but road improvements should take priority.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>
27	Gronquist	Molly	Nov. 06, 2013	Web Mail	<p>Davis lane desperately needs a light near the MoPac north entrance. Traffic is terrible in the morning and I feel I am putting myself at risk every morning trying to leave the neighborhood and turn onto Davis.</p> <p>The thought of my children trying to cross to the other side of Davis lane at any time of the day terrifies me. Out of safety concerns for our neighborhood,</p> <p>I would like to see a light and crosswalk on Davis Lane near the MoPac entrance.</p>	<p>Add traffic light and crosswalk at Davis Lane and MoPac.</p> <p>Pedestrian safety concerns at Davis Lane.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p>
28	Gutierrez	Eduardo	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>There has to be a way to ease traffic congestion on the MoPac south corridor for the evening rush hour.</p> <p>Also, there should not be any pedestrians or bicycles on MoPac going north and south. This is because I strongly believe that it is not safe.</p> <p>The timing of the traffic light on MoPac going north and intersecting with Slaughter is very bad and causes congestion. At the afternoon rush hour, a green light only lets a few cars go by before it turns red again.</p>	<p>Fix timing of light at Slaughter Lane.</p> <p>No bikes or pedestrians on MoPac.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
29	Gutierrez	Karen	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Please improve lanes on MoPac.</p> <p>Please improve traffic lights on Slaughter and MoPac (north and southbound) and also on William Cannon and MoPac.</p> <p>The 290 overpass merging into MoPac south made traffic worse, not better. It is now dangerous to merge from 290 to MoPac south during rush hour. It is also dangerous to merge in and out of the William cannon exit.</p> <p>Please do not build an overpass on La Crosse and MoPac... It will be a monstrosity that I could see from my kitchen window. It will affect the value of our homes; it will increase noise pollution, air pollution, and water pollution.</p>	<p>Support for improvements on MoPac South project.</p> <p>Concerns about the merge between US 290 and William Cannon Drive.</p> <p>Improve signal timing at Slaughter Lane and William Cannon Drive.</p> <p>Do not build an overpass at La Crosse Avenue.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p>
30	Higgins	Nan	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>I live near Circle C Ranch and commute to Dell Round Rock campus. Traffic is very bad during rush hour causing me to spend more than 40 hours weekly on my commute.</p> <p>Quicker access to downtown via alternative solutions. Bus-rapid transit- HOV</p>	<p>Support for transit and HOV lanes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information. R6a</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
31	Hotz	Chris	Nov. 07, 2013	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comments	<p>So one thing I think needs to be done to improve the corridor is the William Cannon exit heading southbound. Currently there's the 290 onramp and then there's an onramp from the access road. So when you're on MoPac and you need to exit on William Cannon, you have to merge twice.</p> <p>And the traffic is almost always backed up. It backs up all the way onto MoPac. So the right lane, even people who aren't trying to exit, slows down tremendously. I think one possible solution is to add an exit from MoPac to the access road before the 290 onramp; they can go under it. So that's one thought. Another option would be is if you actually had two exit lanes for William Cannon because William Cannon itself, the access road to get to it also backs up so far. If you increase the volume there, you might avoid backing up MoPac.</p> <p>I also think that there is there seems to be sufficient pavement to support re-striping to have three lanes all the way from Slaughter up to at least where 290 comes in on MoPac.. It would require removing the left shoulder in some aspects. But there's already pieces of MoPac that's that way anyway. So I think that would also help. I think that's -- that might be all I have right now.</p>	<p>Improve exit at William Cannon Drive.</p> <p>Restripe to accommodate additional lanes between US 290 and Slaughter Lane.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>
32	Howes	Richard	Nov. 06, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I do not support the southern or southeastern extension of MoPac. I have lived in Austin for thirty years and have experienced the increase in traffic but have always felt it should remain a commuter corridor rather than a bypass of downtown. My home is located less than a mile east of the current alignment and I do not want increased truck traffic flowing west of my home and over the aquifer/Town Lake.</p> <p>I would prefer to see any monies earmarked for MoPac go into widening activities (toll or no toll) between Slaughter and 45 North and into encouraging trucks, particularly hazardous materials haulers, into using the 130 tollway as a preferred route. I recommend we reduce or alleviate the cost for trucks to use 130 and mark it as a HazMat route. The traffic on IH-35 and ultimately MoPac will likely benefit well beyond anything we could construct. I don't think we can build enough road to get out of this situation but I think we could manage what we have and can improve (widen) as our way out of this. I live by the mantra that "happiness is never driving on IH-35" so this plan to link up MoPac will directly and negatively impact my daily happiness and the safety of our homes and water supply.</p>	<p>Against extension of MoPac to the south or southeast.</p> <p>Support for improvements on MoPac from Slaughter Lane and SH 45 North.</p> <p>Reroute trucks carrying hazardous materials onto SH 130.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac South Environmental Study is independent and considering improvements from Cesar Chavez Street to Slaughter Lane only. It does not connect to the proposed SH 45SW.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>The Mobility Authority is building one express lane in each direction on north MoPac from Lady Bird Lake to Parmer Lane. Please visit www.MoPacExpress.com for more information on the MoPac Improvement Project. R64a</p> <p>Improvements to IH-35 and SH 130 are outside the scope of this study.</p>
33	Johnson	Sean	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>The lanes that come from the 290/ MoPac flyover onto southbound MoPac and the access road on-ramp, as well as the exit lane for William cannon needs to be changed to improve flow. Traffic comes to a stop in and it is difficult to merge. Also the Barton Skyway on ramp on southbound MoPac should be removed. There's no need for it and people exit and get back on causing backups and unsafe merging. Finally the exit from southbound MoPac onto 360 causes congestion as well as the on-ramp from 360 to southbound MoPac. Maybe instead of exiters merging with drivers on the on-ramp, the opposite should happen.</p>	<p>Improve US 290 flyover, William Cannon Drive exit, Loop 360 entrance and exit ramps.</p> <p>Barton Skyway ramp should be removed.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
34	Jones	Dave	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	Build more lanes please. Remove all bottle necks like the one at US290. At 360, northbound ramps are needed to reduce weaving.	Support additional lanes and remove bottleneck at US 290. Reduce weaving near Loop 360.	Comment noted. The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes. The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.
35	Kallerman	Dick	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	Mass transit should be a major people mover even if "no build" is the decision.	Support of mass transit.	Comment noted. Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.
36	Karr	Catharine	Nov. 18, 2013	Web Mail	I would prefer that a traffic signal be placed at the intersection of Patton Ranch & Hwy 290/71.	Traffic signal needed at Patton Ranch and US 290/SH 71.	Comment noted. Improvements to the "Y" or Oak Hill Parkway are being considered under a separate study, please visit www.oakhillparkway.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the Oak Hill Parkway Team.
37	Lawson	Jenny	Nov. 06, 2013	Web Mail	I would like the city of Austin to make the Davis Ln and MoPac intersection more pedestrian and bike friendly. I commute to Oak Hill for work by bike (Freescale) and would love to see bike lanes extended through the intersection. I would also love to see sidewalks added under the highway. There is a well-worn dirt path that shows the volume of people that are crossing this intersection daily. The dirt path turns into a muddy mess after the smallest amount of rain. I, along with several of my neighbors, love walking and running to Dick Nichols Park. It would be nice to have a sidewalk to safely cross under MoPac. This area of Austin is growing rapidly and property values are steadily increasing. We would like to see some improvements made that promote positive growth and development in our community.	Support for bike/pedestrian access near Davis Lane and MoPac.	Comment noted. Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).
38	Lockhoof	Michelle	Nov. 7, 2013	Comment Form	Please consider extending the right turn lane from northbound MoPac onto Slaughter. It would help with getting the Bowie High School traffic out of the way. Also, S.B. 1029 (senate bill 1029 (authored by Senator Donna Campbell addresses currently free roads NOT being flipped into toll roads. If MoPac falls under this bill, it cannot be tolled!	Extend right turn lane onto Slaughter Lane. Based on SB 1029, MoPac cannot be tolled.	Comment noted. The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team. Any build alternatives considered for MoPac South will be in accordance with State law (SB 1029), the number of non-tolled lanes will be greater than or equal to the number that exists at the time of construction.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
39	McCoy	Rene	Nov. 18, 2013	Web Mail	In regards to the Oak Hill Parkway plans, my husband (Jay McCoy) and I respectfully request for a light to be installed at Patton School Road. That will allow residents of the Oak Park neighborhood to go under the highway to go east instead of going all the way to William Cannon to turn around. It will also be beneficial to parents whose children go to Oak Hill Elementary and for local businesses. Thank you!	Add traffic light at Patton School Road.	Comment noted. Improvements to the "Y" or Oak Hill Parkway are being considered under a separate study, please visit www.oakhillparkway.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the Oak Hill Parkway Team.
40	McGauley	Daniel	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	The idea of improving throughput at MoPac/ Slaughter is very exciting. I work at General Motors in northeast Austin and live in Circle C. Finding ways to cut out minutes on my commute is critical to me. One quick solution would be to lengthen to turn lanes at this area, but a bypass is the most important idea. Also, I'd love to have a transit system that would quickly shuffle people from south Austin to either metro rail or to north Austin. I would consider taking the bus more if it didn't take two hours to get to work. Finally I'd love a safer way to walk from Circle C at Wildflower park to the Alamo theater. Thanks	Support for improvements to MoPac/Slaughter Lane. Extend turn lane at Slaughter Lane. Support for transit and safe pedestrian access.	Comment noted. The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team. Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information. Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).
41	Merritt	Carolyn	Nov. 12, 2013	Web Mail	We need more lanes both North and South.	Additional lanes in both directions.	Comment noted. The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.
42	Miksch	Josh	Nov. 15, 2013	Web Mail	I strongly believe an underpass for the main through traffic lanes of MoPac at Slaughter Lane is necessary for future growth and to address current congestion. With the possible construction of 45-SW even more through traffic will be present, and the current Slaughter lane/MoPac intersections already cannot handle the traffic loads they are experiencing.	Support for underpass at Slaughter Lane.	Comment noted. The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.
43	Miller	Kathleen	Nov. 7, 2013	Comment Form	I oppose construction of SH45SW. It will add unnecessary congestion and will not relieve traffic on Brodie. I favor development of light rail. Send someone to Dallas to learn how to do it.	Support for No-Build Alternative on SH 45SW. Support for rail.	Comment noted. SH 45SW is being considered under a separate study, please visit www.sh45sw.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the SH 45SW Study Team. Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
44	Miralle	Dina	Nov. 18, 2013	Web Mail	I think it is important to have a light at Patton School Road to allow the school traffic and neighborhood to go under the highway to go east instead of the William Cannon turn around.	Request for traffic light at Patton School Road.	Comment noted. Improvements to the "Y" or Oak Hill Parkway are being considered under a separate study, please visit www.oakhillparkway.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the Oak Hill Parkway Team.
45	Mulholland	Karen	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>It's a complex problem and I believe it will require a multi-part solution- no single measure will do more than just postpone the problem.</p> <p>As we saw 15 or 20 years ago when the section from 360 to the river was re-stripped to make it 3 lanes each way instead of two.</p> <p>We need more on/off ramps; we need to optimize traffic light timing on frontage roads. We need safe routes for bicyclists.</p> <p>We need park and ride facilities and tons routes up MoPac & 360.</p> <p>We really need an underpass for through traffic at Slaughter Lane!</p>	<p>Need more on/off ramps.</p> <p>Optimize traffic light timing.</p> <p>Need safe bike routes.</p> <p>Need Park-and-Ride facility at MoPac/Loop 360.</p> <p>Support for underpass at Slaughter Lane.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p> <p>Capital Metro's ServicePlan2020 recommends a new Park-and-Ride in the south MoPac area. Please visit www.capmetro.org/sp2020/ for more information. The Mobility Authority is coordinating with Capital Metro on this recommendation.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p>
46	Myers	Pete & Kara	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>No pedestrians or bicycles on MoPac</p> <p>light rail metro train in median only</p> <p>Something must be done to reduce congestion</p> <p>At least one lane needs to be added in each direction (including just north of the Colorado River where currently only 2-lane bridge exists.)</p> <p>The additional lanes should be HOV-2 but not tolled.</p>	<p>No bikes or pedestrians on MoPac.</p> <p>Support for rail.</p> <p>Add HOV lanes.</p> <p>No tolls.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
47	Naumann	Janet	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Please build more lanes on MoPac. It's the best way to handle the volume of traffic.</p> <p>Also keep bike lanes off of high volume traffic roads.</p> <p>Build another east-west road (Frate Barker or Green Emerald) to provide an alternate route other than Slaughter.</p> <p>Build loop 45.</p> <p>No more environmental studies – stop wasting money and use that money to build the lanes. Widen Brodie Lane.</p> <p>Over or underpass at Slaughter and MoPac. Growth is already here – we need to catch up with volume of traffic. Take care of the people first! Original MoPac was built without Barton Springs being devastated, so it's proven that more roads can be built without damage to environment.</p>	<p>Support for additional lanes on MoPac.</p> <p>No bikes on MoPac.</p> <p>Support for SH 45SW.</p> <p>No more environmental studies.</p> <p>Need additional east-west corridor.</p> <p>Support for underpass at Slaughter Lane.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p> <p>SH 45SW is being considered under a separate study, please visit www.sh45sw.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the SH 45SW Study Team.</p> <p>Environmental studies for transportation improvement projects are required by state and federal laws.</p> <p>Building an alternate east-west route to Slaughter Lane and expansion of Brodie Lane are outside the scope of this study.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p>
48	North	Vicky	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>As a working mother of two special needs children, the length of my commute impacts my ability to care for my family. Neighborhoods in my area are springing up like mushrooms, and the increased traffic has doubled the time I spend driving. Please add more lanes. Nothing less will work.</p>	<p>Add additional lanes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>
49	North	Vicky	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Please lengthen the green light time for northbound MoPac at Slaughter lane. When I started traveling MoPac north from Meridian three and a half years ago, I would wait through the light once. Now I wait through the light five or six times. The light time was appropriate when first built, but needs to be adjusted to accommodate the exponential increase in commuters. During the morning commute, roughly 5 or 6 cars from MoPac northbound made it through the intersection each green light. The number of cars that go through the intersection from Slaughter is much larger.</p>	<p>Improve traffic light timing at MoPac/Slaughter Lane.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
50	Not Given	Not Given	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Please do not consider another toll road</p> <p>HOV lanes work in Houston; why not try them here by adding a third lane.</p> <p>Sharing the roads with bicyclists is dangerous. Consider dedicated curbed lanes for bikes.</p> <p>South Austinites have no other way to travel downtown to partake of what it has to offer other than cars. Perhaps a monorail would be a good option. It would ease surface transportation.</p>	<p>No tolling.</p> <p>Support adding HOV lanes.</p> <p>No bikes on MoPac.</p> <p>Support for transit, monorail is a good option.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information. R6a</p> <p>Based on the Capital Metropolitan Planning Organization's Regional Transportation Plan, CAMPO 2035 Plan, monorail is not under consideration. High-capacity transit, such as monorail, is designed to serve high population and employment densities. Those densities do not exist in the MoPac South corridor today and are not expected to develop over the next 20-25 years.</p>
51	Not Given	Not Given	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Listen to the people who drive on the roads everyday instead of the environmentalists!!!</p>	<p>Listen to drivers instead of environmentalists.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
52	Pantell	Susan	Nov. 08, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I support Transportation Demand Management as the first priority method and Transportation Systems Management as the second priority.</p> <p>I oppose the construction of new lanes for MoPac south of Cesar Chavez. The impacts on the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone and water quality from the construction, additional traffic and growth that results from the project would be too severe.</p> <p>We need to encourage reduction in single-occupant vehicle travel, as well as alternatives such as transit.</p>	<p>Support for TDM and TSM.</p> <p>Do not add lanes on MoPac South, impacts to Edwards Aquifer are too severe.</p> <p>Support for transit</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>An assessment of potential environmental impacts including land use, socio economics, parks, cultural resources, soils, hazardous materials, vegetation, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, water resources, water quality (Edwards Aquifer), floodplains, traffic noise, air quality, visual and aesthetics resources is included as part of this study.</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
53	Perez	Kristi	Nov. 06, 2013	Web Mail	<p>One main concern is the light going north on MoPac at Slaughter - sometimes 2 or 3 cars are all that get through and then people run red lights because they do not want to wait.</p> <p>Also, the traffic getting on MoPac from Davis causes major traffic headaches in the am and near the 290 area.</p> <p>Going south, again the light at MoPac and slaughter is backed up.</p>	<p>Improve traffic light timing at Slaughter Lane.</p> <p>Improve entrance at Davis Lane.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.</p>
54	Sackmary	Stephen	Nov. 11, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I have had more thoughts about the La Crosse and Slaughter intersections since I viewed the maps at the Parkside Village presentations. I think that if Hwy 45 is extended to 1626 and later to I-35 that the Slaughter intersection could become the next "Y" by becoming impossibly congested.</p> <p>The very extension of Hwy 45 will lead to insane rates of home building and road use coming into Travis County out of Hays County.</p> <p>1826 Slaughter-MoPac will become the bypass of choice for people trying to get around the "Y". So, please do not extend Hwy 45.</p> <p>But, if you must do so, then please use underpasses at both Slaughter and La Crosse to prevent the ugliness and noise and light pollution that will be created by overpasses or flyovers that take four lane MoPac high over the cross streets..</p> <p>Also please use high quality road surfacing materials and decent roadbed construction. Today I can hear traffic on MoPac from my house a mile away. The road surfaces are noisy and various repair materials are used resulting in a poor looking road and a noisy one to boot. My taxes ought to be used for higher quality road design and build and maintenance than what I am seeing now. You can do all the environmental studies you want, but when the actual road addition becomes the next step in the increase of visual ugliness, noise, traffic jams and unhampered, ugly growth then the road is itself the biggest contributor to environmental downgrades.</p> <p>And, please, no toll roads. We fought that battle once already and toll roads lost. Good luck</p>	<p>Support for underpasses at Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue.</p> <p>Use high quality road surface.</p> <p>No toll roads.</p> <p>Support for No-Build Alternative on SH 45SW.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>The potential for using porous friction course (PFC) pavement will be evaluated in this study. PFC has been proven to reduce pavement noise and improve the quality of stormwater runoff. More technical information on PFC pavement can be found at: www.utexas.edu/research/ctr/pdf_reports/0_5220_1.pdf and www.utexas.edu/research/ctr/pdf_reports/0_5185_2.pdf.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>SH 45SW is being considered under a separate study, please visit www.sh45sw.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the SH 45SW Study Team.</p>
55	Schisster	James	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Need more lanes and no signalized intersections, possible toll lane with variable tolls based on traffic.</p>	<p>Support for additional lanes, un-signalized intersections and toll lanes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
56	Scruggs	Ed	Nov. 17, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I support expanding capacity on south MoPac (with all measures taken to protect the environment) in order to handle the existing volume of congestion, which is severe throughout the corridor.</p> <p>I would prefer HOV lanes - with express bus travel free of charge, but am willing to examine the managed lane concept with adjustable tolls.</p> <p>If possible, right away should also be set aside for future alternate transit projects (such as light rail, etc.) and bike trails.</p> <p>I strongly urge the completion of these South MoPac improvements prior to any construction of a 45 SW connection to the south end of MoPac. Failing to do so will be a critical mistake that will cause harm to surrounding neighborhoods - which could be swamped with cut-through traffic. At particular risk are the far south MoPac neighborhoods of Circle C (especially Wildflower Park and On the Park sections), Sendera, and Western Oaks. While I know the projects are not officially linked, consideration must also be given to the timing of the proposed Slaughter and La Crosse bridge / underpass construction.</p>	<p>Support added capacity on MoPac South.</p> <p>Prefer HOV lanes and bus transit.</p> <p>Right-of-way should be set aside for future transit and bike trails.</p> <p>MoPac Intersections should be complete prior to construction on SH 45SW.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p> <p>SH 45SW is being considered under a separate study, please visit www.sh45sw.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the SH 45SW Study Team.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p>
57	Shelton	Donald R.	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>There are relatively low cost change I feel could be made in a shorter time frame than proposed that would make small but significant reductions in travel time closing of ramps – the southbound on ramp just north of Barton Skyway comes to mind and choosing which lane to end southbound at William Cannon. That would save time for all commuters.</p>	<p>In favor of closing ramp at Barton Skyway and end one lane going southbound at William Cannon Drive.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p>
58	Sikora	Vincent	Nov. 16, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I think we should do everything possible to eliminate congestion at the MOPAC / Slaughter intersection. The current congestion will get worse each week that goes by.</p>	<p>Support for improvements at MoPac/Slaughter Lane.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p>
59	Stadler	Sebastian	Nov. 14, 2013	Web Mail	<p>It would be in everyone's best interest to plant more trees on the open fields to the right and left of MoPac. These are the areas between MoPac and its service roads. I would be glad to come by your office to draw a layout and with patterns of what I am thinking about. It can be easily designed to reduce any run off from the green areas, consequently the water will soak into the ground and charge the soil hydrology so that the trees can build their root systems faster and clean more air. A combination of fast growing soil building and flowering trees combined with long lived hardwoods can be planted. Please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	<p>Support for planting trees between MoPac and service roads to improve runoff catchment.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The LBJ Wildflower Center's Ecosystem Design Group is a member of the MoPac South Study Team. They will evaluate the current level of ecosystem function along the corridor and then make recommendations on areas in which to preserve, restore or enhance ecosystem function. They will also suggest appropriate, plant based, storm water management strategies to enhance hydrologic function.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
60	Stratford	John	Nov. 17, 2013	Web Mail	<p>Add two north and two southbound general use lanes to MoPac south.</p> <p>Install underpasses at Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Lane.</p> <p>Buildout SH45 from MoPac to IH35.</p> <p>Add a frontage lane between La Crosse and Slaughter Lane for access to the shopping and entertainment center (Alamo Draffhouse Center) so as to off-load traffic from Slaughter Lane.</p> <p>Expedite any environmental studies and traffic studies. Please use this to demonstrate that TxDOT actual can move a project forward at something greater than glacial speed. You have an extremely poor track record in regards to crafting a workable plan and executing in anything approaching 'reasonable' time frames. This is a great opportunity to demonstrate your ability to change that perception.</p> <p>I do NOT support HOV lanes or variable rate toll lanes as planned for the north MoPac project. General purpose tolled express lanes would be acceptable with reasonable charges.</p>	<p>Add additional general purpose lanes in both directions.</p> <p>No HOV or variable toll rate lanes.</p> <p>Support for toll lanes with reasonable rates.</p> <p>Support for underpasses at Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue.</p> <p>Add frontage road between Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue.</p> <p>Support for SH 45SW.</p> <p>Expedite environmental and traffic studies.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>SH 45SW is being considered under a separate study, please visit www.sh45sw.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the SH 45SW Study Team.</p> <p>The MoPac South Environmental Study began in April 2013 and is expected to take 2-3 years to complete.</p>
61	Swartz	Carol	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>Consider future developments – additional housing, possible completion of SH45 – improvements to the Y – these will all impact traffic on MoPac – and add to it substantially – plan ahead! Too many projects in the area have been inadequately planned – by the time improvements are complete, they are already insufficient to handle traffic.</p>	<p>Plan for growth.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The MoPac South Environmental Study is focused on mobility solutions covering the next 20-25 years. Future changes in population and employment and the transportation network factor into possible long-term solutions.</p>
62	Taylor	Sam	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>No existing roads will be tolled!! I remember this when toll roads were first considered. typical government lie.</p>	<p>No toll roads.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>In accordance with State law (Senate Bill 1029), under any Build Alternative the number of general purpose (non toll) lanes on the highway or segment will be greater than or equal to the number that exists at the time of construction.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
63	Thormahlen	Barry	Nov. 14, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I just received the Post Card notice of the Public Scoping Meeting and Open House meeting on Nov. 7th, 2013 for the MoPac South Environmental Study. For over 2 ½ years I have been suggestions two short term quick fixes on how to help relieve congestion on North Bound (NB) MoPac (LP1) at Davis Lane and SBL1 at William Canyon. I suggested that the three NB lanes of LP1 be extended south to Davis Lane on ramp, the pavement is already in-place. This one act of re-stripping would help decrease Davis Lane NB on ramp traffic, which backs up a ¼ mile down Davis Lane in the mornings. This on ramp traffic currently back up NBL1 because it is only 2 lanes wide. FYI, Davis Lane is being widened right now, so more traffic will be coming WB down Davis Lane to get on MoPac. I sent an e-mail almost 2 yrs. ago to TxDOT about this suggestion.</p> <p>I was told over 2 ½ years ago that an Environmental Study would have to be done before these lanes could be re-stripped. How long does it take to complete this type of study? Has it even begun?</p> <p>My other suggestion: was for SBL1 to extend the 3 lanes another ½ mile past where the SB William Canyon on ramp where it merges onto SBL1. Note: SBL1 concrete pavement is in place, only re-stripping would be required. In the afternoon this merging traffic backs up the SBL1 at the SB William Canyon off ramp. This area is a real mess in the afternoon. If a short section of concrete or asphalt pavement were lid between the two long concrete bridges (South of William Canyon) on SBL1, the 3 SB lanes could be extended another mile. This would be well past where the William Canyon on ramp traffic mergers onto SBL1, this would greatly relieve the back-up caused by this SB on ramp traffic from William Canyon. Thank you for your interest.</p>	<p>Support for restriping MoPac to accommodate additional lanes near Davis Lane and William Cannon Drive.</p> <p>Questions about timeframe of study.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>One of the alternatives under consideration is transportation systems management (TSM). TSM components may also be combined with other alternatives to meet the purpose and need for improvements on MoPac South. TSM options include features such as ramp reversals, restriping, signal optimization, and turn lanes.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>The configuration of all ramps, direct connectors (also called flyovers) and weaving zones along MoPac South will be evaluated. This includes areas such as MoPac NB near the Loop 360 entrance ramp, MoPac SB south of US 290, MoPac SB just north of William Cannon Drive, MoPac NB between William Cannon Drive and US 290 along with other areas.</p> <p>The MoPac South Environmental Study began in April 2013 and is expected to take 2-3 years to complete.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
64	VanGoethem	Sandy	Nov. 07, 2013	Comment Form	<p>I feel that the congestion on MoPac could be reduced by creating alternatives for bicycles (and peds); the Violet Crown trail Project should be factored into the MoPac South Project to give cyclers a north-south route.</p> <p>Also, creating an underpass at Slaughter Lane would improve traffic flow while being the least disruptive to Slaughter Lane businesses, etc.</p> <p>It would also allow safer bicycle and pedestrian traffic over MoPac to/from Bowie High School.</p> <p>Traffic could also be improved by improvements to the Enfield Road exit intersection. Additionally having bus service could eliminate a number of commuters.</p>	<p>Support for bike/pedestrian access.</p> <p>Support for underpass at Slaughter Lane.</p> <p>Improvements needed near Enfield Road exit.</p> <p>Support for bus service.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>The Mobility Authority is building one express lane in each direction on north MoPac from Lady Bird Lake to Parmer Lane. Please visit www.MoPacExpress.com for more information on the MoPac Improvement Project.</p> <p>The northern terminus of the MoPac South Environmental Study is Cesar Chavez Street. However, to maintain lane balance and connectivity to the improvements under construction on MoPac north of Cesar Chavez Street (MoPac Improvement Project), the geometry of all the ramps in this vicinity will be evaluated, so that MoPac South improvements are geometrically compatible with the improvements presently under construction.</p> <p>Regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, urban rail and transit express lanes are being studied under a separate project called Project Connect; please visit www.projectconnect.com for more information.</p>
65	Wallace	Scott	Nov. 10, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I live off the S end of MoPac and work where MoPac crosses the river. Therefore, I commute through this project every day. MoPac is the primary N-S route on the western side of the city. It backs up considerably during rush hours and leaves limited alternatives.</p> <p>Vehicular congestion is the primary problem that should be addressed, not mass-transit/multi-modal, etc. Any project that does not first and foremost bring congestion relief is not a wise investment. The CoA has focused an unfortunate percentage of their energy and money on urban rail and the downtown area. This heightens the need for TxDOT & CTRMA to focus on vehicular congestion and the suburbs. There is no one else who can take care of these needs.</p>	<p>Support for congestion relief.</p> <p>Mass transit will not solve the problem.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
66	Welch	Kindra	Nov. 15, 2013	Web Mail	<p>I support environmental concerns, particularly quality of water in the aquifer as the highest priority in this process. Traffic is inconvenient, clean water is necessary. If we ruin our water there will be no need for roads.</p> <p>Next priority: NO TOLLS. Toll roads are just a sneaky poorly implemented tax, a way for well moneyed people to have no traffic while people of less means have the same old scene.</p>	<p>Concern for water quality.</p> <p>No tolls.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>An assessment of potential environmental impacts including land use, socio economics, parks, cultural resources, soils, hazardous materials, vegetation, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, water resources, water quality (Edwards Aquifer), floodplains, traffic noise, air quality, visual and aesthetics resources is included as part of this study.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p>
67	Wiebrand	Jennifer	Nov. 12, 2013	Web Mail	<p>In general concept, I agree with the notion of adding managed lanes to MoPac South. However, it is of great concern to me and my neighbors that the environmental study proceed with great diligence. Sensitivity of the aquifer, nature preserves, endangered species and economic vitality all lie in the balance.</p> <p>However, I am optimistic that because the ROW that exists on MoPac is currently so wide, that much of the disturbance has already occurred - except economically.</p> <p>Please consider the value that the commercial 'node' along Slaughter provides to the neighbors. While 1-3 mile radius traffic is likely not enough to sustain these businesses, the drive-by traffic provided by MoPac is critical.</p> <p>Further, a MoPac over/underpass at La Crosse would be very welcome in order to enhance bicycle pedestrian connectivity to/from the Veloway. This should be something considered with any new State sponsored road package.</p>	<p>Support for adding managed lanes.</p> <p>Concern for aquifer, nature preserves, endangered species and economic viability.</p> <p>Support for the MoPac Intersections project.</p> <p>Support for bike and pedestrian access.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The range of alternatives under consideration include: no build; transportation systems management (TSM); transportation demand management (TDM); adding express lanes that utilize variable tolls; adding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for transit, carpools and vanpools; and adding general purpose lanes.</p> <p>An assessment of potential environmental impacts including land use, socio economics, parks, cultural resources, soils, hazardous materials, vegetation, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, water resources, water quality (Edwards Aquifer), floodplains, traffic noise, air quality, visual and aesthetics resources is included as part of this study.</p> <p>The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).</p>
68	Wittliff	Sally	Nov. 14, 2013	Web Mail	<p>Please use the PFC pavement on all entrance/exit ramps, service roads and bridges--including the bridge over Lake Austin. That pavement makes a big difference in the noise level intruding on adjacent neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Use PFC.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The potential for using porous friction course (PFC) pavement will be evaluated in this study. PFC has been proven to reduce pavement noise and improve the quality of stormwater runoff. More technical information on PFC pavement can be found at: www.utexas.edu/research/ctr/pdf_reports/0_5220_1.pdf and www.utexas.edu/research/ctr/pdf_reports/0_5185_2.pdf.</p>

Table 1. Public Comment and Response Summary

#	Last Name	First Name	Date	Method	Comment (verbatim)	Comment (summary)	Response
69	Wittmeyer	Bob	Nov. 07, 2013	Court Reporter/ Verbal Comments	Austin needs to plan for growth similar to what Houston does. Houston builds roads miles outside of the city or any development when land is cheap, and nobody objects. Austin needs to take a few lessons from Houston. That would be one of the few. We needed roads ten years ago. We desperately need them now.·The bikers do not belong on heavily traveled thoroughfares. We're building a thirty-mile hike-and-bike trail from South Austin to Central Austin. The bikers can use that. That would keep everyone safer and reduce the cost of new road construction for bike lanes. Cars sitting in a parking lot on MoPac pollute just as much as cars traveling at speed except they do it for a lot longer period of time, therefore producing more pollution over the aquifer that people want to protect.	No bikes on MoPac. Austin needs to plan for growth.	Comment noted. Pedestrian and bicycle access is being evaluated as part of the MoPac South Environmental Study. Also, the Study Team is coordinating with the Hill Country Conservancy and the City of Austin regarding the Violet Crown Trail (http://www.hillcountryconservancy.org/land-projects/violetcrowntrail/).
70	Zachary	Raymond	Nov. 17, 2013	Web Mail	It is inconceivable that the study of the MoPac corridor would stop at Slaughter Lane at the south end. Limited access over crossing or under crossing at Slaughter Lane and at La Crosse must be integrated into traffic flow analysis for all of MoPac south of downtown. Full flow analysis should also include the plans under consideration to extend the corridor further south towards San Marcos. Piecemeal approaches at the planning stage should not be driven by incremental funding of implementation. Piecemeal planning of parts of a network makes the false assumption that networks can be optimized without consideration of the interfaces to parts of the larger network of which the network under consideration is a part.	Support for MoPac Intersections project. Include MoPac Intersections in MoPac South traffic analysis.	Comment noted. The MoPac Intersections project has independent utility. Improvements to the Slaughter Lane and La Crosse Avenue intersections would provide operational utility without having to make any other improvements to existing MoPac South or SH 45SW, and would function without the construction of SH 45SW to the east. Please visit the MoPac Intersections page on www.MoPacSouth.com for more information. This comment has been shared with the MoPac Intersections Team. The traffic analysis will include all projects listed in the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's (CAMPO) Regional Transportation Plan, CAMPO 2035 Plan. Please visit www.campotexas.org/plans-programs/campo-plan-2035/ for more information.