

Appendix D

Public Comments

- D.1 Fall 2017 Public Outreach and Feedback**
- D.2 Summer 2018 Public Outreach and Feedback**

D.1 Fall 2017 Public Outreach and Feedback

1. September 26, 2017 Public Meeting comments/questions and emails
2. Online Survey Comments - September 27, 2017 to October 31, 2017

Spicewood Springs Road Public Meeting Comments


Comments in this section were collected via question and comment cards at the September 26, 2017 public meeting or by email.

	Public Meeting Questions - September 26, 2017
1	Will crash history be public for street as it is now?
2	Tubes are measuring traffic now complete? What are red ribbons around trees? Full picture of what survey crews are putting out? Please describe. Why is ATD not working with Parks Dpt regarding Stillhollow with Barrow Preserve? Or, is ATD doing this?
3	What is the minimal width for turn lanes, sidewalks and bike lane? Will we see stop lights required at major cut outs?
4	How much of this project is being driven by 1) giving access to Mopac express lane? 2) PUD to be built at Mopac? 3) increased development along Spicewood Springs Road?
5	Would this road be open to 18 wheel or heavy trucks?
6	How much ROW does the city have on each side of current road?
7	What is pedestrian requirement for sidewalks? It's mostly commercial
8	What if project cost exceeds \$17 million?
9	Sidewalks on both sides of this project? And curbs? A middle turn lane most of the length of it? Add one stop light at Abor and Stillhouse condos to slow down traffic and allow ingress. For Dipti, please let me know when have first draft design for separate project - Hart at Spicewood Springs - Brad Additional source of funding beyond \$17 million if needed? Lower or enforce speed limit to 35-40 mph whole length. Multiple postings of those speed limits along there (3-4 each)
10	What is the cost per yard? 17 million / distance
11	What is the value of a center median on this part of the road? It seems the space could better be used for turn lanes and space for bikes. Does the expansion of the roadway require sidewalks? If so, where?
12	We're concerned about more cars cutting through Neeley's Canyon Condos between Steck and Spicewood Springs. Do you have any suggestions or help for us if there's such a problem? Getting out of our entrances could be a difficulty for Neely's residents, too?
13	Impact on Spicewood Springs to Mesa ??? At Hart Lane and Spicewood Springs Road. Speed limit - city want 45 mph from Mopac to 360 - the neighborhood wants 30 mph - now it is 35. Crashes on Spicewood Springs between Mopac and Mesa
14	Is your presentation available online or will you send copies? What will \$17 million cover? Can you use historical costs to estimate this? What type of traffic control is being considered?
15	Why not have just a center median/turn lane and keep a 2-lane road? Will there be traffic lights installed at every entrance to Spicewood Springs Road?
16	Need improvement on Old Spicewood to Spicewood Springs steep slope at intersection impairs access to Spicewood Springs. Are there any plans to improve Spicewood Springs to Old Spicewood Springs connection?
17	Why is such a large project needed (eg 4 lanes)? Current traffic conditions do not warrant! What is anticipated?
18	Is expansion 4-5 lanes for entire length? Egress from driveways across 2 lanes of traffic? Expected speed limit? Is there room for sidewalks and bike lanes?

	Date	Public Meeting Comments and Emails	Full Text Attachment Number
1	2017-09-26	Connect sidewalks	
2	2017-09-26	Please maintain/extend sidewalk and cente turn lane extended. Thank you.	
3	2017-09-26	I live at Stillhouse Canyon (4711 Spicewood Springs Rd) (across from the Real Estate building). See full comments in attachment.	17
4	2017-09-26	In general, all Spicewood Springs traffic goes onto 360. With improvements to the intersection, Spicewood Springs traffic will increase.	
5	2017-09-26	This acfess is very steep and causes spin outs when going onto Spicewoods Road.	
6	2017-09-26	Clear grass and low brush along road - both sides.	
7	2017-09-26	Sidewalk both sides from here to Cedar Creek Ind Pk where sidewalk ends.	
8	2017-09-26	Don't widen.	
9	2017-09-26	Put a turn lane or median along Spicewood Springs Road to hill. Improves safety and does not unduly increase traffic.	
10	2017-09-26	Extend turn / one only to steep part and at Adirondack only. Avoid high volume egress from 360. Leave room for sidewalk and bike lanes.	
11	2017-09-26	People have little need to cross this road - medians aren't really useful.	
12	2017-09-26	How will I turn left?	
13	2017-09-26	If median is added will need to facilitate u-turns.	
14	2017-09-26	Traffic light or similar mechanism to break up traffic - not sure want.	
15	2017-09-26	Traffic light? Spicewood Springs Hill. Stillhouse Canyon Condos 180 units	
16	2017-09-26	Roundabout? similar set up to Riverside by Long/Parmer...	
17	2017-09-26	Easement crosses our retaining wall	
18	2017-09-26	Consider deer and other wildlife when setting speed limits etc.	
19	2017-09-26	I'd like the design to consider pedestrians, speeders. Crossings for pedestrians.	
20	2017-09-26	This already a speedway. Also, if you take the medians out, you will have people passing in the left turn lane.	
21	2017-09-26	If adding sidewalk - don't need them on both sides, people don't walk here.	
22	2017-09-26	Traffic backs up during rush hour.	
23	2017-09-26	Are there any individual private driveways?	
24	2017-09-26	Please make sure bike facilities are appropriate for high bicycle speeds going down such a steep hill. (eg not grying to share a sidewalk with pedestrians).	
25	2017-09-26	As far as construction goes... less is better. Keep nature preserve in mind.	
26	2017-09-26	Can the above ground utilities - power lines, etc - be put underground as you do this?	
27	2017-09-26	This u-turn needs to remain so the people at Caprock Canyon can get home.	
28	2017-09-26	If the 183/360 interchange was improved, the mobility issue on Spicewood Springs Rd might improve.	
29	2017-09-26	Two lanes both ways from here to Mesa	
30	2017-09-26	Perfer 1 center lane rather than 2 traffic lanes on each side.	

	Date	Public Meeting Comments and Emails	Full Text Attachment Number
31	2017-09-26	Noise concern	
32	2017-09-26	Heavy truck traffic concern.	
33	2017-09-26	Need bike lane and sidewalk entire length.	
34	2017-09-26	Keep speed limit low.	
35	2017-09-26	How will I turn left across 2 lanes of high speed traffic?	
36	2017-09-26	GREAT CONCERN: With increased traffic on Spicewood Springs Road and no traffic lights - how will people turn right or left across lanes of traffic, depending on their side of the road? Are you going to have to go the wrong way and turn around? Give us	1
37	2017-09-26	Elevated WW line? 18" or 12"?	
38	2017-09-26	Danger with right/left turn during rush hour at present.	
39	2017-09-26	Concern: expanding this road will only encourage cut-through drivers trying to get from Mopac to 360 and will encourage more cut through from Spicewood Springs/McNeil down Old Spicewood Springs up the Spicewood Hill and going east toward Mopac. This is a nightmare am and pm. Also, Old Spicewood Springs is too narrow and winding to be designated as a bike corridor. We use this to get back and forth to our houses and watch near misses with bikes and cars weekly.	
40	2017-10-30	1) Much prefer 2 lanes and median. Definitely opposed to a 4 lane, or 4 lane plus median. 2) Much prefer sidewalks on both sides of the road. Definitely oppose a single wide sidewalk on one side because then half the walkers would have to walk across the road to use the sidewalk	
41	2017-10-30	I think there should be a sidewalk on Spicewood Springs Road, at least on one side of the road. It would be better on both sides.	
42	2017-10-30	Keep it 2 lanes with 2 sidewalks	
43	2017-10-30	1) Please show the traffic flow change in last 5 years. 2) Add sidewalk (two ways). 3) Add bike lane (two ways).	
44	2017-10-31	On behalf of the Stillhouse Canyon Condominium Board we would like to make the following comments to proposed changes to Spicewood Springs Rd (the project.) Individual board members may have also submitted comments and those should be given full weight	2
45	2017-10-24	Having spent 50 years living near the section of Spicewood Springs road between Mesa and 360, my input is that this section of road is NOT appropriate for bike or pedestrian lanes. Who on earth would attempt to walk or ride a bicycle up that hill? And on	3
46	2017-10-31	Our offices are located at 4520 Spicewood Springs Road. I tried to make a comment on the map but was unable to do so. My main comment is that the big hill on Spicewood Springs Road is no place for bicycles (or walkers). It is quite steep and will create	4
47	2017-10-14	My comment is.... "Emphasize the use of highway systems, discourage use of neighborhood streets. Keep the road way accessible for the NW Hills community, not for "cut-through" traffic. The street is already littered with dead deer and other animals. Addi	5
48	2017-10-13	I read over the online PDF of the Sept. 26, 2017 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD PUBLIC MEETING. I drive that intersection frequently. The main problem I've always had was the steep slope. But the PDF suggests looking beyond the road itself. There is old Spicewo	6

	Date	Public Meeting Comments and Emails	Full Text Attachment Number
49	2017-10-26	I do want to express my strong opposition to the mobility project on spicewood springs between mesa and 360. as a resident of mesa village at 4159 steck ave (which abuts spicewood just west of mesa), I voted against this bond, specifically for the fact t	7
50	2017-11-01	I am following-up to underline comments I submitted on behalf of the Austin Board of REALTORS® using the online comment tool. We look forward to continuing to be engaged in this process along with other businesses directly along Spicewood Springs that s	8
51	2017-10-26	I suggest Spicewood Springs Road between Hwy 360 and Mesa Drive be widened to 4 lanes plus a continuous turn lane. If that is not possible due to right of way cost, then other options like 4 lanes plus an intermittent turn lane, 4 lanes without a turn l	9
52	2017-10-31	Has the Spicewood springs road gotten to the area where the 40 ft cut would be to make code requirements? Have you spoken to the former department heads that tossed those plans to add lanes years ago?	
53	2017-11-01	Thanks for the second informative meeting given at Still House Canyon last evening. Regarding our HOA and the consensus, we suggest the following: Create a center turn land for the involved portion of Spicewood Springs; create bike lanes and sidewalks if	10
54	2017-11-06	My concern is that CapMetro is cutting back on the meager transit service in the Spicewood Springs area. This is a big mistake. As the population grows in this area there will be demand for transit service. I hope that the city will work with Cap Metr	11
55	2017-11-01	I have just moved into a condo at 4711 Spicewood Springs Road in Stillhollow Canyon. I have watched your informative video overview of the project to improve the flow and safety along Spicewood Springs Road from Loop 360 to Mesa Drive. This is certainly	12
56	2017-11-01	I own and reside in Unit 167, Stillhouse Canyon Condos (hereafter Stillhouse) 4711 Spicewood Springs Rd. (hereafter Spicewood). I attended the ATD's 1st community input meeting at church and meeting at Stillhouse clubhouse. I thank ATD for inviting commu	13
57	2017-11-03	I'm an owner at Stillhouse Canyon and was at the meeting the other night. Thank you for coming out and giving the presentation / answering our questions. It was really helpful. I wanted to share some feedback on the project. Like some others at the meet	14
58	2017-11-01	Thanks for coming to Stillhouse yesterday to give the presentation on the Spicewood Springs road project. It was very informative and helpful. I do think the road needs to be expanded to some extent, at least adding in the center turn lane to help reliev	15
59	2017-10-31	I came to the community meeting at Stillhouse Canyon last evening. Thank you for presenting information about possible changes to Spicewood Springs Road that would effect our neighborhood. I have lived at Stillhouse Canyon since 2008 and have seen the	16
60	6/19/2018	Emily, While I understand the need for roads in Austin, I feel that the expansion of Spicewood Springs Road is not the solution. It will encourage more traffic to "cut-through" the neighborhood, speed on the residential streets and add to the chaos at the intersection of Mesa Drive and Spicewood Springs Road.	18
61	6/29/2018	Hello, We live in N.W. Hills. We have concerns about the future construction to Spicewood Springs between Mesa and 360. Is there proposed plan we can view? Many us cross Spicewood Springs from Adirondack the to Old Spicewood Rd. This is a dangerous intersection.	19



Dube, Kiersten

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 7:45 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Cc: david greene; Marc Duchon; Seth K; Mike H; Kefren Greenstreet; carolyn wright
Subject: comments to SSRd. project.

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Cheyenne:

On behalf of the Stillhouse Canyon Condominium Board we would like to make the following comments to proposed changes to Spicewood Springs Rd (the project.) Individual board members may have also submitted comments and those should be given full weight as well.

We propose:

1. keeping SSRd a 2-lane road and adding:
2. a median/center turn lane the length of the project to improve both mobility and safety.
3. a sidewalk on both sides of the road for the length of the project or at a minimum to reach Stillhouse Canyon Condos as a number of our residents walk or would like to walk to the nearby shopping centers.
4. bike lanes on both sides of the road for the length of the project as numerous bicyclists like to ride the road and the challenging hill. also, residents of Stillhouse ride to Mesa to connect up with its bike lanes. some of our residents ride bicycles as a primary mode of transportation.

we are strongly opposed to a four lane road with center lane because:

1. building a larger road will not really alleviate traffic but only bring more traffic to this E-W corridor and change the quality of life for those who already live and work along the road.
2. a bigger road will prompt developers of vacant space along the road to build even bigger projects arguing that the infrastructure already exists.
3. such a 5-lane project along with sidewalks and bike lanes cannot be realized with the current \$17M budget which means building in phases. Building in phases will mean years, not months, of construction disruption along the road that will adversely impact quality of life (time delays, noise and dust) as well as property values as long as the construction continues.

General Concerns:

1. we are concerned about the difficulty of making a left turn out of our driveway during commute times and encourage you to consider how to address this for us and other residences and businesses along the road.
2. we are interested in maintaining a sense of a country road that is still prevalent on weekends and after rush hours most days. we do not want another 2222 or 2444 on Spicewood Springs Road.
3. we would like the construction project to be finished quickly once begun to minimize adverse impacts on residents and traffic. we do not want a project that must be done in phases because of its scope or costs.

thank you for your careful consideration of our comments. we very much appreciate that you and your colleagues visited us at Stillhouse last night to make a presentation to our neighbors. we appreciate the City's openness to our comments and input.

Sincerely,
President, Board of the HOA
Stillhouse Canyon Condominiums

Dube, Kiersten

From:
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2017 4:54 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne; 2016 Bond
Subject: Input: Spicewood Springs road project

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged


Hello,

Having spent 50 years living near the section of Spicewood Springs road between Mesa and 360, my input is that this section of road is NOT appropriate for bike or pedestrian lanes. Who on earth would attempt to walk or ride a bicycle up that hill? And only someone with a death wish would ride a bike down that hill. I seriously doubt any pedestrians would walk down it either. Please don't think generically about this (we generically want to add pedestrian bike lanes everywhere).

Please be realistic, which means acknowledging that this stretch of road is NOT a reasonable candidate for bike or pedestrian lanes, given its topography. This issue makes a good litmus test for any alleged consultants: if they recommend pedestrian or bike lanes, fire them and hire someone with some common sense.

Heart,


Dube, Kiersten

From: 
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 11:19 AM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Subject: Mobility Bond Spicewood Springs Rd
Attachments: donf.vcf

Cheyenne:

Our offices are located at 4520 Spicewood Springs Road. I tried to make a comment on the map but was unable to do so. My main comment is that the big hill on Spicewood Springs Road is no place for bicycles (or walkers). It is quite steep and will create major safety problems for both motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. Sidewalks and bicycle lanes don't make any sense on this hill.

Thanks,



The information contained in this electronic-mail message is confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone or return electronic-mail message and delete the sent message immediately. Thank you.

Dube, Kiersten

From: Krause, Cheyenne
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2017 10:44 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 2016 Mobility Bond - Spicewood Springs to 360 from Mesa Drive

Hi [REDACTED], thank you for your comments and I apologize for the issues with the online tool. I've made sure your comments are included in our analysis.

Cheyenne
Cheyenne Krause
Public Information Specialist, Sr.
Austin Transportation Department
512-974-7907

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 14, 2017 2:37 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne <Cheyenne.Krause@austintexas.gov>
Subject: 2016 Mobility Bond - Spicewood Springs to 360 from Mesa Drive

Cheyenne,

Tried to use the "feedback" tool. It would not allow comments.

My comment is.... "Emphasize the use of highway systems, discourage use of neighborhood streets. Keep the road way accessible for the NW Hills community, not for "cut-through" traffic. The street is already littered with dead deer and other animals. Adding lanes and increasing traffic is not an acceptable solution. Two lanes with defined bike and pedestrian traffic is acceptable. Bus traffic is necessary, however, that seems to keep being canceled.

The recent addition of speed bumps on Mesa Drive has made a difference... more would help. Additional traffic patrolling would help also. The speeding and bad driving in the neighborhood is out of control.

Adding more traffic is not welcome!

Thanks!

Dube, Kiersten

From: Krause, Cheyenne
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2017 10:49 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Loop 360 and Spicewood Springs Road.

Hi [REDACTED],

I apologize for the delay in responding to your comments. I wanted to let you know we received your feedback and will include it in our analysis.

I also wanted to make sure you're aware that the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has plans to improve the intersection of Loop 360 at Spicewood Springs. It's likely the improvements will include grade-separating Loop 360, over Spicewood. You can read more about the proposal here: <http://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/projects/studies/austin/loop-360.html>

Please let us know if you have any additional questions.

Cheyenne Krause
Public Information Specialist, Sr.
Austin Transportation Department
512-974-7907

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2017 5:25 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne <Cheyenne.Krause@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Loop 360 and Spicewood Springs Road.

I read over the online PDF of the Sept. 26, 2017 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD PUBLIC MEETING.

I drive that intersection frequently.

The main problem I've always had was the steep slope.

But the PDF suggests looking beyond the road itself.
There is old Spicewood Springs, Bluffstone, plus
360 itself.

How about doing Spicewood like Enfield/15th street over Lamar? I guess it's 15th by the time it gets to Lamar. Don't go down the slope, but keep it level and go over Loop 360. Eliminates the lights completely.
I guess do a little partial 4-leaf clover for the connections, like at 35th and Mopac.

Then do away with the low-water crossing for old Spicewood completely. Connect old Spicewood to Bluffstone, either at 360, or further North, closer to Yaupon.

Some extra lanes for 360 to allow traffic to merge on and off.

And then rename the whole thing either Bluffstone or Anderson. Why does one road have 3 names?

Dube, Kiersten

From: Krause, Cheyenne
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 12:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Tuttle, Emily
Subject: RE: Spicewood 360 Project

Hello [REDACTED],

We did receive your comments and apologize for issues accessing the map. We will include your comments in the analysis for a potential project. It's important to note we're currently in preliminary engineering, so every option – including a no build scenario – is on the table. We have much more evaluation to do before we come back to the public with options in 2018.

Thank you for your time.

Cheyenne Krause
Public Information Specialist, Sr.
Austin Transportation Department
512-974-7907

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2017 5:07 PM
To: 2016 Bond <2016Bond@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Spicewood 360 Project

Hi,


I cannot get the comment map to work, and do not anticipate being able to be present at one of the community meetings.

I do want to express my strong opposition to the mobility project on spicewood springs between mesa and 360. as a resident of mesa village at 4159 steck ave (which abuts spicewood just west of mesa), I voted against this bond, specifically for the fact that it includes work on this section of road. this mobility project is also the key reason i voted against the previous city council district incumbent. i am opposed to anything that will increase or in any way cater to vehicular traffic on this stretch of road. if you want to turn the road into a beautiful walking garden or something along the lines of an elevated highway, that would be great. however, let's keep the traffic to 360, 183, mopac, etc., instead of improving a short cut for people through these roads and let's not cater to businesses on the street. i object to what i believe will effectively create a mini highway through a residential neighborhood. in fact, this is nearly already the case. i am of course greatly concerned about what this could mean for my property, as i worry about road expansion, and of course endless construction. it would be nice to have full sidewalks and generally have the road more pedestrian friendly so that we could walk down to the trail along 360. but let me repeat that the goal here should be to move cars off this road, not to make room for more of them or to ease their way. i oppose this project with all my heart and will work to mobilize public support to hold all public officials accountable.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Dube, Kiersten

From: 
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 6:59 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Cc: Paul Hilgers; Emily Chenevert; Borkar-Desai, Dipti; Gavin Staats
Subject: Re: Spicewood Springs Rd Mobility Project

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Cheyenne, I am following-up to underline comments I submitted on behalf of the Austin Board of REALTORS® using the online comment tool. We look forward to continuing to be engaged in this process along with other businesses directly along Spicewood Springs that share our concerns.


We are first and foremost concerned about improving safety of vehicles entering and exiting our headquarters on 4800 Spicewood Springs Rd. We believe safety could be improved by a traffic light somewhere near the two driveways to our offices. This could be inclusive of a pedestrian crossing that is only triggered by either a pedestrian pressing the crossing button or an inductive loop / detection camera that would detect when a car pulls up to the light from the building on the driveway.


The reason for needing this type of device would be to interrupt the flow of traffic on Spicewood Springs as it is currently very dangerous to merge into traffic during peak flow times or to take a left to enter the building coming from 360.

We are supportive of expanded capacity along Spicewood Springs Rd as called for in the 2016 Mobility Bond. However, we believe any additional capacity must be paired with safety improvements that improve and certainly do not exacerbate existing hazards to travelers entering or exiting businesses along Spicewood. Adding additional lanes of traffic without being paired with traffic lights or similar devices to protect vehicles would increase hazards and be very problematic for ABoR and other businesses along Spicewood.

Thank you, and please reach out if you need any clarification on any of these comments.

Best,





The Spicewood Springs Road Mobility Project is currently in the preliminary engineering phase. The City of Austin invites citizens to provide input about the existing conditions of Spicewood Springs Road between Mesa and Loop 360. Now through Oct. 31, comments on the predesign phase can be submitted at [MailScanner has detected definite fraud in the website at "app.getresponse.com". Do not trust this website: http://arcg.is/2znE0Gi](http://arcg.is/2znE0Gi).

If you were unable to attend the public meeting last month, or if you would like access to more details on the project, please visit the Spicewood Springs Road project page [here](#).

For any further questions, or to request a small-group presentation on the Spicewood Springs Road project, feel free to contact Cheyenne Krause at Cheyenne.Krause@AustinTexas.gov, or by calling (512) 974-7907.

Additionally, details on all projects funded by the 2016 Mobility Bond Program can be found through the [City of Austin Project Explorer](#). The site has critical cost and status information, as well as contact information and websites for every bond project. More projects will be added monthly throughout the entire eight year bond timeframe.

Dube, Kiersten

From: Krause, Cheyenne
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 12:43 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Tuttle, Emily
Subject: RE: Spicewood Springs Road Expansion

Hello [REDACTED],

We did receive your comments and will include them in our analysis. Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Cheyenne
Cheyenne Krause
512-974-7907

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2017 2:26 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne <Cheyenne.Krause@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Spicewood Springs Road Expansion

Hi Ms. Krause,

I suggest Spicewood Springs Road between Hwy 360 and Mesa Drive be widened to 4 lanes plus a continuous turn lane. If that is not possible due to right of way cost, then other options like 4 lanes plus an intermittent turn lane, 4 lanes without a turn lane, etc. could be considered.

The current configuration with reductions from 2 travel lanes to 1 in each direction, and no turn lane at all, is not working well.

I'd also suggest getting an actual count of current bicycle traffic on this stretch of roadway before spending money and pavement on bike lanes. It is nearly impossible to bike up the steep hill on this road, and the steep descent is very dangerous. I doubt there would be significant bicycle traffic even with bike lanes.

Thank you,

Dube, Kiersten

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Subject: Spicewood Green HOA respkne

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello:

Thanks for the second informative meeting given at Still House Canyon last evening. Regarding our HOA and the consensus, we suggest the following: Create a center turn land for the involved portion of Spicewood Springs; create bike lanes and sidewalks if allowed by the current right of way. Avoid adding additional through lanes because of the potential impact on increasing traffic flow from 360 to MoPac. This project involves mostly residential owners which includes Neely's Canyon, Still House Canyon, Spicewood Vista, and Spicewood Green.

In my discussion with the commercial property owners near us, they pretty much agree with a plan that will not increase traffic flow but which will add safety for turning onto and out of the current 2 lanes.
This amount of work should stay in budget in my estimate.

Thank you.

Regards,

[REDACTED]
President Spicewood Green HOA
[REDACTED]

Dube, Kiersten

From:
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2017 9:40 AM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Subject: Spicewood Spg comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello,

I was unable to figure out the online mapping tool so I am writing an email. A tool is not helpful if it is too difficult for average people to figure out how to use it!

My concern is that CapMetro is cutting back on the meager transit service in the Spicewood Springs area. This is a big mistake. As the population grows in this area there will be demand for transit service. I hope that the city will work with Cap Metro to improve/upgrade existing service in the area, not eliminate it as current plans would seem to indicate.

Dube, Kiersten

From:
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 10:26 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Subject: Spicewood Springs development project

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Cheyenne,

I have just moved into a condo at 4711 Spicewood Springs Road in Stillhollow Canyon. I have watched your informative video overview of the project to improve the flow and safety along Spicewood Springs Road from Loop 360 to Mesa Drive. This is certainly important especially with the additional development expected along this route and east to MoPac.

I am particularly concerned about the following issues:

1. Safe access entering and exiting condominium complexes and businesses along the route. Right now we have one of the few center turn lanes at 4711 Spicewood. This is absolutely necessary with the volume and speed of traffic along Spicewood Springs Road.
2. We desperately need a fully accessible sidewalk along the route. Many of the businesses and residences are within walking distance of the shops and restaurants along Mesa Drive, but it is currently not safe to walk along Spicewood Springs Road. As public transit expands there will also need to be allowances made for bus stop waiting areas.
3. I am concerned about access to our condo complex during the construction phase. Right now there is only one driveway into/out of the complex which cannot be blocked during road construction.

I worked for the City of Cambridge, MA for 10 years and am somewhat familiar with the time and scope of similar projects. I have also worked in the disability field and am knowledgeable about access for people with disabilities along roadways and intersections and during street and sidewalk renovations. These guidelines will be doubly important if we should end up with a sidewalk on only one side of Spicewood Springs Road.

I have registered for regular updates on the project. Thanks for your attention to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Dube, Kiersten

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 05, 2017 8:23 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Subject: Spicewood Springs Project--Citizen Input
Attachments: 024.jpg

Dear Ms. Krause: I own and reside in [REDACTED] Stillhouse Canyon Condos (hereafter Stillhouse) [REDACTED] Spicewood Springs Rd. (hereafter Spicewood). I attended the ATD's 1st community input meeting at church and meeting at Stillhouse clubhouse. I thank ATD for inviting community input.

I am against expansion of the two miles of Spicewood Regional Modality Project (hereafter Project) as outlined in Prop 1, i.e., widening to four lanes, center median, sidewalks/bike facilities, etc. based on the following:

Environmental

- Stillhouse Hollow Nature Preserve is 19.8 acres on the south side of this Project. The acreage begins along the 4100 block of Burney Drive (off Mesa) and the .2 mile trail actually backs up to Marquis at Caprock Canyon 4411 Spicewood. The Preserve Stillhouse Hollow lies directly below Stillhouse (south and west).
- Barrow Preserve is east of Stillhouse Hollow. Both Preserves are almost identical in wildlife habitat.
- Both Preserves' acreage is proposed Balcones Canyonland Preserve (BCP) conservation habitat zones.
- The Bull Creek Watershed and identified Preserves are known habitat of protected, threatened and endangered species.
- It's been stated that ATD is working with the City's Parks & Rec Dept regarding this "environmentally sensitive" area. I believe this is a shortfall on the part of ATD.
- The ATD's environmental consultant should be working with numerous City, State and Federal authorities to ensure wildlife habitats are not disturbed and to assure citizens that Austin has a commitment to maintain "The Best of Texas Wildlife Habitats."

ATD's "Position" on this Project

It was explicitly stated by ATD staff at 1st community input meeting that this Project must be similar to any other City street project to incorporate 4 lanes, medians, bicycle lanes and sidewalks. This is a generalization that is not only incorrect on its premise but should NOT even be given consideration. I'm sorry, I've lived 59 yrs. in Austin and NO two roadways and/or projects are the same.

Based on the above I only favor the following regarding Project implementation:

- Keep the current roadway one-lane in each direction and add a center turn lane;
- Add sidewalks on both sides of the street;
- Add a designated bike lane only on one side of the street; and
- Have very minimum Project egress in order to implement these changes.

Ms. Krause you indicated at the Stillhouse Clubhouse meeting that you live nearby, off Anderson Lane. I implore you and ATD staff to visit the Stillhouse Hollow Preserve, take the .2 mile paved hike to the observation platform. Sit on the benches listen to the water below (streams feeding into the Bullcreek Watershed), the sounds of birds and view the wildlife. (attached picture)

I was happy that we owners at Stillhouse Canyon Condos were able to "cue the deer" upon ATD's arrival at our Clubhouse. In reality these deer walk from the canyon daily and cross to the other-side-of-Spicewood to the canyonland that sits below ABOR and Neely's Canyon condos.

Thank you for your time, attention and consideration to my input. Best, [REDACTED]



Dube, Kiersten

From:
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2017 5:50 AM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Subject: Spicewood Springs Rd project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Cheyenne!

I'm an owner at Stillhouse Canyon and was at the meeting the other night. Thank you for coming out and giving the presentation / answering our questions. It was really helpful.

I wanted to share some feedback on the project. Like some others at the meeting, I share concerns about the idea of our neighborhood street being turned into a main thoroughfare between Mopac and 360. I'd prefer there to be no changes to the number of lanes. Our neighborhood is also home at a lot of wildlife and allowing more traffic on that street would result in a greater danger to them.

There are a few changes I would be interested in seeing. A lot of us walk on the south side of the street and having a sidewalk put in would be helpful. There's a pretty well-worn path between Stillhouse Canyon and where the sidewalk starts just west of the Marquis at Caprock Canyon.

I'd also like to see a change to where it pinches from two lanes to one on the north side of the street (heading west on Spicewood Springs Rd). It's not well-marked which lane continues and which one needs to merge and it is nearly weekly where my car is almost hit by drivers that don't realize they need to get over. Improvements like clearly painted lane arrows indicating which lane continues or possibly stanchions would be very helpful.

Finally, it was mentioned that people were having some difficulty leaving feedback on the map. I recently wrapped up a fellowship at the Innovation Office at the City and wanted to mention that they were trying out a few different ways to collect public feedback. Angela Hansen would be a good person to contact if there's any interest in trying out some other tools when it comes to collecting feedback in the future.

Thank you!

Dube, Kiersten

From:
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 7:49 PM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Subject: Spicewood Springs Road project

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Cheyenne,

Thanks for coming to Stillhouse yesterday to give the presentation on the Spicewood Springs road project. It was very informative and helpful. I do think the road needs to be expanded to some extent, at least adding in the center turn lane to help relieve congestion from people turning left.


Also it might be worth noting that the westbound side gets considerably more traffic than the east bound side, especially during rush hour. Not sure if it makes sense to only widen one side, but that is really where the traffic seems to be directed.

I think sidewalks are important to add here too, I know on the south side there are paths of grass worn away from pedestrians walking from our complex to Randall's, not sure about the north side.

One more thing is that when the road narrows to 1 lane, sometimes people get caught off guard and don't always merge seamlessly. This is probably the most dangerous part of the road. Maybe more signs would help to catch driver's attention, or widening the westbound side to 2 lanes.

In any case, I hope you are able to find a solution that is beneficial for everyone. Thanks again for coming to spread this information.

Dube, Kiersten


From: 
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 11:20 AM
To: Krause, Cheyenne
Subject: Spicewood Springs Road~~changes

I came to the community meeting at Stillhouse Canyon last evening. Thank you for presenting information about possible changes to Spicewood Springs Road that would effect our neighborhood.

I have lived at Stillhouse Canyon since 2008 and have seen the increase in traffic and the problems it causes.

Preferences and observations:

- *Sidewalks on both sides of the street
- *Bike lanes on both sides of the street
- *Turn lanes similar to the one at 4711 Spicewood Springs Road turning into Stillhouse Canyon
- *Speed limit of 30 mph--enforced
- *The current speed limit 35/30 is ignored by the majority of drivers who often drive 50+ mph; rare enforcement of the speed limit.
- *Disregard of narrowing from two lanes to one lane near the Animal Hospital
- *Deer in the area require reduced speed; many have been killed by cars.



I live at Stillhouse Canyon (across from the Real Estate building). Sp. Springs (both sides)

- * Safety is a concern. It can be really hard to turn left onto Sp. Springs, even w/ the turn lane. (the turn lane ~~can be~~ ^{really scary} from my complex)
- * However, I'd rather not encourage even more traffic on Sp. Springs than there already is.
- * My complex has a really nice driveway w/ lots of trees & I'm worried about what will happen to it if the road is widened. I'm hoping that if the driveway is modified, there will be city money available to make it as nice as it is now.
- * Sidewalks would be ~~more~~ nice - especially if they're not right next to the traffic.
- * Speed of cars on Sp. Springs is also a concern. Drivers go ~~so~~ so fast, it can be difficult to turn right or left. over →

know my concerns/wants are contradictory!! :)

so - the light at 360 + Sp Springs can
it really backed up when you're headed
outh on 360 & turning left onto Sp. Springs.
I've waited 4-5 changes at that light
in the middle of the afternoon.

Dube, Kiersten

From: Massie-Gore, Jennifer
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 2:07 PM
To: Dube, Kiersten
Subject: FW: Spicewood Springs Road

Kiersten,
Can you please add this one to our public comment section?

JMG

From: Tuttle, Emily
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 1:41 PM
To: Massie-Gore, Jennifer <Jennifer.Massie-Gore@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Landry, Genest <Genest.Landry@austintexas.gov>
Subject: FW: Spicewood Springs Road

fyi

From:
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 10:27 PM
To: Tuttle, Emily <Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Spicewood Springs Road

Emily,

While I understand the need for roads in Austin, I feel that the expansion of Spicewood Springs Road is not the solution. It will encourage more traffic to "cut-through" the neighborhood, speed on the residential streets and add to the chaos at the intersection of Mesa Drive and Spicewood Springs Road.

The area is a "No Through Trucks" and we have a constant stream of over-sized vehicles that hit trees, near miss pedestrians, and are not able to navigate on the narrow neighborhood streets.

Like others, I understand the convenience -- as a member of the neighborhood: the additional traffic is NOT welcome. I can't safely walk along or cross Mesa Drive due to the high volume of traffic (that is speeding). The street markings are not accurate. The businesses at the corner of Mesa Drive and Spicewood Springs Road cause confusion and accidents. Add in students, people waiting on buses, and general neighborhood traffic -- it is the recipe for a disaster.

This is just a bad decision to proceed --- unless the traffic proposal includes MAJOR calming and curbs/medians to keep cars in their lanes the expansion will ruin one of Austin's oldest neighborhoods. It has already taken a "blow" with the approval of the Austin Oaks Pud (which was not welcomed by the community).

Seems like there is another solution other than a super-highway through a neighborhood.

Thanks!

Dube, Kiersten

From: Massie-Gore, Jennifer
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2018 11:32 AM
To: Dube, Kiersten
Subject: FW: 2019 Spicewood springs

An additional comment from a resident.


JMG

From: Tuttle, Emily
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2018 10:42 AM
To: Massie-Gore, Jennifer <Jennifer.Massie-Gore@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Landry, Genest <Genest.Landry@austintexas.gov>
Subject: FW: 2019 Spicewood springs


fyi

From:
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2018 12:09 PM
To: Tuttle, Emily <Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov>
Subject: 2019 Spicewood springs

Hello,
We live in N.W. Hills. We have concerns about the future construction to Spicewood Springs between Mesa and 360.
Is there proposed plan we can view?
Many us cross Spicewood Springs from Adirondack the to Old Spicewood Rd.
This is a dangerous intersection.



As you can the yellow and red lines over lap. The green area is very hard to see over for on coming traffic.



This intersection is not straight across. Causes a lot of confusion.
The intersection is not marked with crosswalks or continuous sidewalks.
Thank for any information you can supply with.

Spicewood Springs Road Online Survey Comments

All comments in this section were collected via an online map from September 27, 2017 through October 31, 2017

			Online Map Comment	Commentor Zip Code	Date
1	BIKE	CHANGE	include bike lanes for NB cyclists, and increase turning safety onto Old Spicewood Springs	78705	2017-09-25
2	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Access into and out of Stillhouse canyon condos without requiring a u-turn like other complexes with divided roadways	78759	2017-09-26
3	DRIVE	CHANGE	this is and will not be safe for bicyclists	78731	2017-09-26
4	DRIVE	KEEP	Motorists frequently go over the speed limit. Please keep current speed limit. I fear expanding the road to 4 lanes would not only make it harder to get in/out of my home everyday, but would encourage speeding. Also, no additional traffic lights please!	78759	2017-09-26
5	WALK	CHANGE	There are lots of runners in the neighborhood that can't safely access the road where there's no sidewalk. Please make it safer for walkers/runners.	78759	2017-09-26
6	DRIVE	KEEP	Please keep the current speed limit as there are a lot of deer that cross this road and people already speed through here.	78759	2017-09-26
7	DRIVE			0	2017-09-26
8	SAFETY_CONCERN			0	2017-09-26
9	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	deer/wildlife... this is a Nature Preserve and the last thing we want is more travel lanes/traffic going right thru	78759	2017-09-26
10	SAFETY_CONCERN		Many motorists are not currently mindful about deers and wildlife and speed through the road. Keep road 2 lanes and current speed limit, but add more warning signs for deers please.	78759	2017-09-26
11	SAFETY_CONCERN			0	2017-09-27
12	WALK		sidewalks	78731	2017-09-27
13	WALK		sidewalks	78731	2017-09-27
14	DRIVE		driving	78731	2017-09-27
15	DRIVE		driving	78731	2017-09-27
16	DRIVE		Slow down traffic to a stop at least one place between Mesa and 360	78731	2017-09-27
17	SAFETY_CONCERN		speed limits signs	78731	2017-09-27
18	SAFETY_CONCERN		speed limit signs	78731	2017-09-27
19	TRANSIT	CHANGE	If project goes over \$17M, use traffic impact fee funds to do the full project needed.	78731	2017-09-27
20	DRIVE	CHANGE		0	2017-09-27
21	DRIVE	CHANGE	This section of road needs to be two lanes in each direction. Stops should be minimized as to keep congestion low and traffic flowing. This is an important east-west route for people trying to get into or out of north central Austin avoiding 183.	0	2017-09-27

			Online Map Comment	Commentor Zip Code	Date
22	WALK	CHANGE	Instead of sidewalks for walkers/runners, could there be a crushed granite separated from the road path that connects to the park trails instead? Similar to say, the one on Lake Austin Blvd. near Red Bud trail and Hula Hut?	0	2017-09-27
23	BIKE	CHANGE	connect up to fully separated/protected bike facilities along this section of 360	78757	2017-09-27
24	DRIVE		Incorporate TxDOT design for Loop 360 and Spicewood Springs interchange	78759	2017-09-27
25	DRIVE			0	2017-09-27
26	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	I forgot to mentions this at the meeting: There are many deer that cross Spicewood between Mesa and the beginning of the big hill. I probably see a dead deer about once a month. Maybe something could be done to help prevent deer/car collisions??	78759	2017-09-28
27	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	78731	2017-09-28
28	SAFETY_CONCERN			0	2017-09-28
29	DRIVE	KEEP	As one of the many residents that live on this street, it is frustrating to see permanent changes made that makes our home less green and more traffic. Please keep current speed limit and 2 lanes for safety of the many wildlife and residents.	78759	2017-09-29
30	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Please maintain/fix damaged guard rail	78759	2017-10-01
31	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	Better warning signs for drivers to keep alert for deer and follow speed limit.	78759	2017-10-01
32	BIKE			0	2017-10-02
33	BIKE	CHANGE	#1 priority is to add bike lanes on both sides of street between Mesa and 360. It very dangerous trying to ride in either direction.	78759	2017-10-02
34	DRIVE	CHANGE	I am VERY opposed to expanding road to 4 lanes. This would prevent residents from turning left because it would be very difficult to cross 2 lanes of traffice.	78759	2017-10-02
35	DRIVE	CHANGE	I feel that traffic mitigation could be improved by adding a center lane for left turns in either direction. Expanding to 4 or 5 lanes would create terrible problems for existing residents.	78759	2017-10-02
36	DRIVE	KEEP	the median strip by Walgreens is just fine the way it is. Don't waste money by changing it.	78759	2017-10-02
37	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Cars already travel at 50 plus mph. Adding more lanes would make it easier to sustain high speed in this area causing significant safety issues.	78759	2017-10-02
38	DRIVE	KEEP	Keep just 2 lanes and add a 3rd turn only lane. Expanding to 4 lanes makes it easier for heavy trucks to use this road way causing excessive noise and safety issues.	78759	2017-10-02
39	WALK	CHANGE	need a sidewalk to get down to Randall's.	78759	2017-10-02
40	WALK	KEEP	Keep the beautiful medians between lanes to preserve natural landscape and wildlife.	78759	2017-10-02

			Online Map Comment	Commentor Zip Code	Date
41	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	Intersection with Old Spicewood Springs Road is already difficult to navigate. Please improve grades at this intersection. NO BIKE LANES. Protect wildlife with signs and speed limit.	78750	2017-10-03
42	DRIVE		ice accumulation	0	2017-10-03
43	WALK	CHANGE	The sidewalk ends between the Veterinary Hospital and the newer Realtor building to the west. Dangerous!	78759	2017-10-04
44	BIKE	CHANGE	I've never understood why a bike lane was added to the eastbound side of Spicewood Springs and yet not on the westbound side. There are VERY few cyclists capable of climbing that huge hill, but many who would benefit from the other direction.	78759	2017-10-04
45	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	I live here. Do not expand the road to 4 lanes. The beauty of the green space and the natural habitat have been impacted enough. 4 lanes will encourage more traffic here at higher rates of speed. Our residents don't need more traffic through there.	78759	2017-10-11
46	BIKE	CHANGE	A bike lane going toward 360 would be incredibly beneficial.	78723	2017-10-12
47	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	cars from adirondack to spicewood often pull out without a good view of the cars coming down the hill. That leads to some scary new misses.	78759	2017-10-13
48	DRIVE			0	2017-10-13
49	BIKE	CHANGE	Need to incorporate fully-separated bicycle facilities along both sides of street.	78759	2017-10-13
50	BIKE	CHANGE	Separated/Protected bike lanes, both North and South	78759	2017-10-13
51	BIKE	CHANGE	I frequently take spicewood between	0	2017-10-13
52	BIKE	CHANGE	Need bike lanes along both sides of road	78759	2017-10-13
53	BIKE			0	2017-10-13
54	BIKE	CHANGE	protected bike lanes	78759	2017-10-14
55	DRIVE	CHANGE	safety, convenience	78759	2017-10-14
56	DRIVE	CHANGE	safety and convenience.. extend the 2nd lane that begins just up the hill as an entry ramp to spice wood springs.	78759	2017-10-14
57	DRIVE	CHANGE	left turn lane going west	78759	2017-10-14
58	BIKE	CHANGE	Safety	78731	2017-10-14
59	DRIVE	CHANGE	Old Spicewood slope is too steep here. Stopped cars have trouble taking a right, especially in wet weather. Suggest regrading intersection for slightly flatter slopes or roughen up pavement to minimize tire slips.	78759	2017-10-14
60	DRIVE	KEEP	curve at rest area before ABOR is already tight and road is as close as can be to dwellings/buildings on both sides. How can that be widened further? Guard rails have already been re-done and stabilized from accidents hitting that curved area.	78759	2017-10-15
61	BIKE	CHANGE	Bicycle safety	78759	2017-10-16
62	BIKE	CHANGE	Remove bike lanes from this road. There is safer alternative	0	2017-10-16

			Online Map Comment	Commentor Zip Code	Date
63	DRIVE	CHANGE	Make the road 4 through lanes from Mesa to Blue Grass. Insert left turn lanes as need.	78759	2017-10-16
64	BIKE			0	2017-10-16
65	DRIVE	CHANGE	need to increa capacity. The road needs to be 4 lanes from mesa to bluegrass. no bike lanes are need because there is alternative on Adnacki	78759	2017-10-17
66	DRIVE	CHANGE	Build an overpass, for 360 and have spicewood spring under. make a frontage rd that connects old spice wood to Bluegrass/Spicewood.	78759	2017-10-17
67	WALK	CHANGE	There need to be sidewalks all the way down Spicewood Springs.	78731	2017-10-17
68	WALK	CHANGE	This intersection needs to be safer to cross on foot. Drivers taking a right from any part of the intersection do not look to see if anyone is crossing the street before they make a right against the light.	78731	2017-10-17
69	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Expanding to 4 lanes and adding traffic signals will make turning out of complex more dangerous. Currently the speed limit is 30 miles an hour but actual flow of traffic is anywhere from 40 MPH to 50 MPH.	78759	2017-10-19
70	DRIVE	KEEP	Adding traffic signals will defeat the purpose of going to 4 lanes, just like on portions of 360 most traffic is caused by traffic lights stopping flow of traffic. 4 lanes will also destroy a lot of the beauty of Spicewood Springs, and impact wildlife.	78759	2017-10-19
71	DRIVE	CHANGE	Bicycles shouldn't be in this area	78731	2017-10-23
72	BIKE	CHANGE	Many cyclists frequent this downhill (westbound) side of this hill. It would be to the benefit of motorists and cyclists if there was a bike lane (and even more a protected bike turn to go on Old Spicewood Springs. Thanks!	78745	2017-10-23
73	BIKE	CHANGE	Need protected bike lane on this descent	78751	2017-10-23
74	BIKE	CHANGE	Incorporate separated bike lanes in both directions. Incorporate speed control devices for vehicular traffic going westbound on Spicewood Springs.	78731	2017-10-24
75	BIKE	CHANGE	Bike safety. Please add bike lanes. I know many people who bike along this road	0	2017-10-24
76	BIKE			0	2017-10-24
77	BIKE	KEEP		0	2017-10-24
78	BIKE	KEEP	do NOT build an overpass	0	2017-10-24
79	BIKE	CHANGE	Please add protected bike lanes	0	2017-10-24
80	WALK	CHANGE		0	2017-10-24
81	DRIVE			0	2017-10-25
82	DRIVE	CHANGE	needing additional lanes to continue across 360	78759	2017-10-25
83	DRIVE			0	2017-10-25
84	DRIVE	CHANGE		0	2017-10-25

			Online Map Comment	Commentor Zip Code	Date
85	DRIVE	CHANGE	steepness of 360 at left hand turn should change for a smother turn from both left lanes. Its hard to leave intersection in this current street configuration.	78759	2017-10-25
86	DRIVE			0	2017-10-25
87	DRIVE	CHANGE	No bike lanes at all allowed in this seetp portion of road, from 360 to Mesa Dr. It'sway to congested and steep to have to negotiate around a bike.	0	2017-10-25
88	DRIVE	CHANGE	turn off at old spicewood springs	78759	2017-10-25
89	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	turn off at old spice wood Springs	78759	2017-10-25
90	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	bike lanes should not be included on this road. Conditions do not yield for bike lanes, bikes can use alternate routes. Old Spicewood Springs Road is not suited for bicycle travel.	78750	2017-10-25
91	TRANSIT		lack of commitment by CapMetro to providing transit service in this area	78717	2017-10-25
92	DRIVE	KEEP	lanes. Limit to 2 lanes (current) + 1 turn lane at most. Anything more will be excessive.	78759	2017-10-26
93	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	lanes. People already speed constantly with a single lane. It will get worse with more capacity. Limit to 2 lanes + 1 turn lane at most	78759	2017-10-26
94	DRIVE	CHANGE	The intersection needs to have two lanes going forward to cross 360. Traffic is a bear in the mornings getting out of Bluegrass.	78759	2017-10-26
95	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	full two lanes and a turn lane downhill to access Bluffstone. To many cars get cought not knowing which lane is which.	78759	2017-10-26
96	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	You need a full turning lane in each direction and room for the bikes in both directions. Flying down hill at 50 mph into a traffic backup is unwise.	78759	2017-10-26
97	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	The whole project needs to be a full 4 lane with additional seperate bike lanes on the hill on both sides. Its a blind enterance and exit at the top of the hill. The R?W was aquired years ago. USE IT.	78759	2017-10-26
98	SAFETY_CONCERN		A systems wide view is needed. Changing Spicewood is not isolated, it will impact other roads esp with addition of Austin Oaks redevelopment	78731	2017-10-26
99	BIKE		Austin is a biking city, yet no biking needed on this road	78750	2017-10-26
100	SAFETY_CONCERN		Look holisticslly at traffic impacts to area at large - expanding Spicewood will impact other streets (Mesa, 360, Steck, Adirodinac...)	78750	2017-10-26
101	DRIVE		Speeds need to be lowered on this part of Spicewood - too many turns into drives and fast traffic (beyond posted speeds)	78731	2017-10-26
102	BIKE	CHANGE	protected bike lanes - we need them here! Traffic is going super fast.	78701	2017-10-26
103	DRIVE	CHANGE	add more lanes, the cars are already here	78731	2017-10-27
104	WALK	CHANGE	walkable trails from the park to a sidewalk to mesa	78731	2017-10-27
105	DRIVE	CHANGE	Have a safe turn left out of Spicewood Springs Animal Hospital	78727	2017-10-27
106	DRIVE	CHANGE	this section of spicewood needs to be widened to include a turn lane	78731	2017-10-27
107	DRIVE			0	2017-10-27

			Online Map Comment	Commentor Zip Code	Date
108	DRIVE	KEEP	Keep two-lane road to preserve this environmentally sensitive area; strictly enforce speed limit for safety of residents and wildlife; add sidewalks to enhance accessibility	78759	2017-10-28
109	DRIVE	KEEP	Keep two-lane road to preserve this environmentally sensitive area; strictly enforce speed limit for safety of residents and wildlife; add sidewalks to enhance accessibility	0	2017-10-28
110	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Many motorists tend to go 10+ mph over the limit. Adding more lanes would only encourage this unsafe behavior	78759	2017-10-28
111	BIKE	KEEP	Adding bike lane will not enhance safety due to the steep grade; as a cyclist I would still avoid this part of the road even if bike lane is added	78759	2017-10-28
112	DRIVE	KEEP	Keep 2 lanes with potential addition of left turn lane	78759	2017-10-29
113	DRIVE	CHANGE	Add overpass at 360 Spicewood Springs intersection. Make both left and right turns smoother	78759	2017-10-29
114	DRIVE	CHANGE	This intersection is super-dangerous especially when it is raining. Cars coming down the big hill can't stop in time if something obstructs their lane here.	78726	2017-10-29
115	WALK	CHANGE	Non-Resident Traffic - those using SWS instead of 183 is dramatically impacting the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and animals. As a resident I would like to see a toll put into place for non residents of the local zip codes to preserve local safety.	78759	2017-10-30
116	DRIVE	CHANGE	Non-Resident Traffic - those using SWS as a thoroughway instead of 183 is dramatically impacting local safety. I am required to make a left hand turn out of my driveway and often cannot do so due to heavy non-resident traffic. I propose a toll for all no	78759	2017-10-30
117	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	Speeding / traffic - many non-residents speed through our NEIGHBORHOOD with no concern for residents or wildlife. I would like to see non-residents discouraged from using SWS as a speedway to get non-locals to their homes more than 3 miles away.	78759	2017-10-30
118	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Speed Limit needs to remain at 30MPH. Too many deer are hit by cars who are probably not residents and don't know any better to slow down.	78759	2017-10-30
119	DRIVE	KEEP	lanes	78759	2017-10-31
120	DRIVE			0	2017-10-31
121	DRIVE	CHANGE	increase flow through intersection at Mesa and Spicewood springs	78759	2017-10-31
122	WALK	KEEP	no sidewalks are needed	78759	2017-10-31
123	BIKE	CHANGE	no bike lanes needed	78759	2017-10-31
124	DRIVE	CHANGE	put in left turn lanes	0	2017-10-31
125	DRIVE	KEEP	remain speed limit at 35mph	78759	2017-10-31
126	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	make a larger left turn lane	78759	2017-10-31

			Online Map Comment	Commentor Zip Code	Date
127	DRIVE	CHANGE	speeding	78759	2017-10-31
128	WALK			0	2017-10-31
129	WALK	KEEP	Spicewood Springs Road	78759	2017-10-31
130	WALK		no additional road lanes wanted	78759	2017-10-31
131	DRIVE			0	2017-10-31
132	DRIVE	KEEP	the number of road lanes, no increase	78759	2017-10-31
133	WALK	CHANGE	would like sidewalks	78759	2017-10-31
134	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	Need for traffic light or other flow regulation device that will create breaks in traffic during peak periods.	78759	2017-10-31
135	SAFETY_CONCERN	CHANGE	It is very dangerous to turn left or right onto Spicewood Springs during peak hours. This needs to be addressed if the road is to be expanded.	78759	2017-10-31
136	DRIVE	CHANGE	We support adding capacity where appropriate but are concerned about safety issues, particularly centered around attempting to merge into traffic during peak times.	78759	2017-10-31
137	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Safety, too many people are crossing from MOPAC through Spicewood Springs Rd to get to 360 and then north on 183 to wherever they are going. Now you are planning on expanding the road to make it easier for them to do this while injecting even more traffi	78759	2017-11-01
138	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Why inject more traffic in the community when you can fix your MOPAC to 183 problems?	78759	2017-11-01
139	DRIVE			0	2017-11-01
140	DRIVE	KEEP	Clogged up 183 traffic going downtown is cutting though S S road and you are planning on injecting even more traffic?	0	2017-11-01
141	DRIVE	KEEP	Dear planner, how about I shove the rush hour traffic in your neighborhood? Why shove in mine instead of fixing your 183 and MOPAC problems?	78759	2017-11-01
142	DRIVE	KEEP	95% fo the people on Spicewood Springs Rd have no relation to the neighborhood	0	2017-11-01
143	DRIVE	KEEP	If a person living in Cedar Park is every day on Spicewood Springs Rd cutting through the neighborhood to go south why are you making it easy for them by "improving" the road. Why don't you fix your 183/MOPAC problems???	78759	2017-11-01
144	DRIVE	KEEP	Another genius plan to fix a problem on main arteries by pushing traffic to small neighborhood streets. NO to this project!!!	0	2017-11-01
145	SAFETY_CONCERN			0	2017-11-01
146	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	Any good project starts with a lititimate survey. Have you surveyed where all the traffic is coming from on Spicewood Springs, well let me tell you: most of it has no connection to the neighborhood, it is cutting through to go north and south during rush	0	2017-11-01

			Online Map Comment	Commentor Zip Code	Date
147	SAFETY_CONCERN	KEEP	How about planning experts you simulate placing this expansion project in your neighborhood and the associated traffic with it and see how it feels before you apply it on Spicewood Springs Rd?	78759	2017-11-01
148	DRIVE	KEEP	Before you do this project how about your answer a few questions first please: 1. Why are you doing this project in the first place? Are you planning to beautify the road? Are you planning to make the road more safe? You just want to shove more traffic!!	78759	2017-11-01
149	DRIVE	KEEP	How about you tell us and make public where most of the traffic on Spicewood Springs Rd is coming from?	78759	2017-11-01
150	DRIVE	CHANGE	Signalilng on Loop 360 @ Spicewood Sprints	78732	2017-11-01
151	DRIVE	CHANGE	Light at Loop 360 needs to react to traffic backups on Loop 360. Presently turns green too often for Spicewood springs during the day and doesn't let traffic catch up , when rush hour hits this becomes a major issue since already backed up.	78732	2017-11-01
152	DRIVE			0	2017-11-01
153	DRIVE			0	2017-11-01
154	DRIVE		Why create more traffic on Spicewood Springs than we already have? If travel is easier more cars will use Spicewood Springs. Put speed humps in to slow everybody down and discourage cars from using it as a cut through.	78759	2017-11-01
155	DRIVE	KEEP	I strongly advocate keeping Spicewood Springs Rd as a two-lane road as it passes Stillhouse Canyon condominiums (4711). There is a nature preserve very close to the road at this point. Don't make this road a higher-speed corridor like Parmer Rd!	78759	2017-11-03
156	DRIVE	KEEP	Please keep Spicewood Springs Rd as a two-lane road as it passes Stillhouse Canyon condominiums (4711). There is a nature preserve very close to the road. We do not need high speed transit here!	78759	2017-11-03
157	WALK	CHANGE	Lack of sidewalks, please build a side with street trees between the sidewalk and the road	78759	2017-11-03
158	TRANSIT	CHANGE	Please add a transit connection on this road	78759	2017-11-03
159	WALK	CHANGE	Please add a crosswalk with a pedestrian island in the middle. The nearest crosswalks are half a mile away	78759	2017-11-03

D.2 Summer 2018 Public Outreach and Feedback

1. Public Meeting Boards - August 29, 2018
2. Public Meeting Comments - August 29, 2018
3. Online Survey Comments - August 30, 2018 to September 14, 2018
4. Email Comments

Spicewood Springs Road Public Meeting Boards


Boards were displayed at the August 29, 2018 public meeting for Spicewood Springs Road.

SPICEWOOD SPRINGS ROAD



REGIONAL MOBILITY PROJECT


PROJECT LIMITS



Spicewood Springs Road from Loop 360
to 0.2 miles west of Mesa Drive


2016 MOBILITY BOND

\$720 million for transportation and mobility improvements citywide



ANTICIPATED TIMELINE

(subject to change)



EXISTING CONDITIONS



- One vehicular travel lane in each direction (two eastbound lanes east of Loop 360)
- No continuous center turn lane
- Bicycle lane in eastbound direction only
- No continuous sidewalk facilities
- No curb or buffer zone
- Missing water quality facilities

WHAT WE'VE HEARD

CONNECTIVITY

Concern about lengthy commute times

Missing bike facilities

Concern about lack of sidewalks and ADA accessibility

Missing safe crosswalks

Concern about rush hour congestion

Concern about additional regional traffic

Challenging left turns into and out of driveways

MOBILITY

Concern about unsafe left turns

Desire for improved pavement conditions

Concern about speeding

SAFETY

Concern about impact on wildlife

Concern about impact on surrounding area roads


QUALITY OF LIFE

Desire to see more roadway signage


Concern about changing the character of Spicewood Springs Road

Concern about additional car collisions with area deer if road is widened

NO BUILD



4900 - 4926 Spicewood Springs Rd




4620 - 4800 Spicewood Springs Rd

- No improvements made to current roadway
- Includes TxDOT's Loop 360 grade separation project




ALTERNATIVE A




POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

- One travel lane in each direction
- Center median with median gaps to allow left turns and U-turns at certain locations
- Separated raised bike lane and sidewalk facility
- New water quality elements in median




ALTERNATIVE B




POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

- Two travel lanes in each direction without a center turn lane or median
- Left and right turn access remain the same as present-day conditions
- Shared use path on both sides of the road for people walking, biking or using a wheelchair
- New water quality elements




ALTERNATIVE C

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS




- Two travel lanes in each direction
- Center median with median gaps to allow left turns and U-turns at certain locations
- Shared use path on both sides of the road for people walking, biking and using a wheelchair
- New water quality elements in median



MOBILITY

Peak Hour Delay in Minutes



Peak Hour Level of Service

Alternative	A.M. Westbound Commute	A.M. Eastbound Commute	P.M. Westbound Commute	P.M. Eastbound Commute
Current Roadway (2017)	C	C	D	C
No Build (2027)	C	C	F	C
Alternative A (2027)	C	C	F	F
Alternative B (2027)	C	C	F	C
Alternative C (2027)	C	C	D	C

Level of Service Grades


- A = Free flow
- B = Reasonably free flow
- C = Stable flow
- D = Approaching unstable flow
- E = Unstable flow
- F = Gridlock

SAFETY

EXISTING ROADWAY

Vehicle Crash Locations

2012-2017



PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Potential Crash Reductions

- **Roughly 70% fewer head-on crashes in Alternative A and Alternative C** as a result of new medians*
- **Roughly 40% fewer crashes of all types in Alternative A and Alternative C** as a result of new medians*
- **25% fewer bicycle and pedestrian-related crashes in Alternative A, Alternative B and Alternative C** as a result of off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities*

* CMF Clearinghouse (cmfclearinghouse.org) / USDOT FHWA

Vehicle Conflict Points

Conflict points are points where the paths of two through or turning vehicles diverge, merge, or cross. They are associated with increased levels of roadway accidents.



PARTNER PROJECTS



Loop 360

- Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) studying Loop 360 and implementing improvements to increase pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular mobility and safety
- City of Austin contributing funding to four intersections along Loop 360, including Spicewood Springs Road/Bluffstone Lane
- Construction at Spicewood Springs Road/Bluffstone could begin by FY2022

Learn more at Loop360Project.com



Old Spicewood Springs Rd Low Water Crossing

- City of Austin Watershed Protection Department recently completed feasibility study
- Study recommends closing low water crossing to motorized vehicular traffic for flood safety reasons
- Closure considered in conjunction with TxDOT's Loop 360 improvements

CULTURAL RESOURCE INVENTORY



In late 2017, a Travis County Historical Commission member contacted the project team with information about possible historic sites and archaeological resources of significance in the Lower Bull Creek Greenbelt.



The City commissioned a Cultural Resource Survey to identify or rule out the existence of these items within the Spicewood Springs Road project limits, including any artifacts that may be buried below ground.



The Cultural Resource Survey found one possible historic resource within the project limits, which will be further evaluated during the design phase of the project.



NEXT STEPS

Community Feedback

Submit feedback on the draft alternatives:

- At this open house
- Online at [AustinTexas.gov/SpicewoodSpringsRd](https://austintexas.gov/SpicewoodSpringsRd) from August 30 through September 14

Recommended Alternative

Staff will finalize one alternative for improvements this fall. This alternative will be carried into the design phase of the project.

Design Phase

The selected alternative will continue to be refined through the design phase of the project. This phase will last 1-3 years.

Construction

Construction will begin after the design phase and should be complete by 2024.

Continued Engagement

City staff will continue coordinating with stakeholders and the community throughout the life of this project.

CONNECT WITH US!

AustinTexas.gov/SpicewoodSpringsRd



[@AustinMobility](https://twitter.com/AustinMobility)



Facebook.com/ATXTransportation



Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov

Capital Project Explorer: (Project ID 11880.001)

Spicewood Springs Road Public Meeting Comments

All comments in this section were collected via comment card at the August 29, 2018 public meeting for Spicewood Springs Road.

#	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
1	I'm concerned about the intersection at the bottom of the steep hill on Adirondack Trail & Spicewood Springs Rd.	- Noise barrier needed on Plan B & C on Northside of Road. - Concerned with the amount of traffic on plan B & C.	Option A with noise barrier.
2	"A" should be the choice. Traffic feed from the East & West of the project is going to massively increase the current volume. The current occupants will be negatively affected.	See "A." The western proposed turn lane should extend to include to most western driveway prior to going west down the hill.	A only.
3			I know it's unrealistic, but traffic in general will get worse anyway. Gondolas w/ connecting transportation/ We need to think outside the box!
4	Something needs to be done. My office at 4600 Spicewood - PM to turn left is impossible.	Draft B with 2 lanes of traffic in PM - left turn would be a real hazard.	Draft C seems best to reduce traffic and safer turn with median.
5	I liked all 3 alternatives that kept the turnaround at 4520 Spicewood Springs Road. I liked the fact that the bicycle lanes/walking lanes were separated from the auto lanes. It probably makes sense to make it 2 lanes in each direction. It would be great to keep the median all the way to loop 360.	[left blank]	Fit interests.
6	Alternative C looks to be the best solution. 1. This allows for more traffic to flow in both directions. 2. Looks like the safest proposal.		Alternative C
7	- Added capacity. - Added shared use paths. - Incorporating landscaped medians.	- Additional capacity will induce more trips. - Speeding. - How pleasant it will be to use shared use path.	C - it's got everything! Hard to stomach A, if it doesn't add capacity or seem to do "enough"
8		I am concerned about the increased road and motor noise from more traffic. The noise is already loud, especially in the steep part of the hill near 360, because of the engine revving required to get up the hill.	I prefer C for safety and traffic efficiency - as long as there is a sound barrier on the north side to protect the residential Spicewood Vista community (where I live).
9	It appears to be well considered.	The neighboring community (Spicewood Vista) is greatly impacted by the noise as well as the visual results of the work. We prefer that the road is widened primarily on the southside of Spicewood Springs.	(C) is the preferred solution.
10	Since I live in a house on Spicewood Springs, my primary concern is to enter and exit my property. Any alternatives that increases traffic on SS Rd is obviously not in my best interest. From that standpoint, Alternative A is best for me.	[left blank]	Alternative A. Easier entry and exit to my house.
11	I like that all alternatives consider bike and pedestrian and disability needs.	I think Alternative A does not have enough lanes to address mobility concerns. I think alternative B has safety concerns having no turn lane in the median.	I prefer C because it seems to best combine the trade off between mobility and safety.
12	I prefer nothing to be done to Spicewood Springs. I live on Spicewood Springs and don't want extra lanes for more traffic or construction.	Too much excess traffic. Considering there is a nature preserve with many deer and other animals it makes it dangerous for drivers and the animals.	I prefer no change or no build. If one has to be build I pick Alternative A because it keeps one lane in each direction.
13	I think the bike lanes are the most important part. Could be going overboard on all the turnarounds.	Construction timings.	"B" but with the bicycle lanes from "A."

#	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
14	I like the visual image.		I like "C" - prefer a median - adds safety and school buses can stop on side without both sides needing to stop, like 2 lanes in each directions with turn around lanes. Aids traffic flow, gives passing lanes + ability to get around a stopped vehicle + emergency vehicles have a quicker mobility. Like bicycle and walking paths for safety, go both directions. Don't like that it takes 6 years to complete.
15	[left blank]	[left blank]	Did not see option for only 1 bike lane. Very steep hill, hardly any bike traffic.
16		TX DOT having over/underpass on 360 is a great idea	B is too little and C is too much. We need only 1 bike lane and it doesn't need to have land between it and the road. There NEEDS to be 2 lanes each direction and a turning lane for SURE.
17	*All options: Intermittent bike lane is dangerous - must be continuous.* Alternative C is best; offers: 2 travel lanes each direction, left turn lanes; keeps bikes and pedestrians off street.	B offers NO left turn lane. A does not offer more lanes therefore does not relieve traffic. **The section of SWS b/w Mesa and Mopac where the lanes are separated by office buildings... often drivers pull onto SWS & turn into head on traffic (the road is one way but 2 lanes). "Right turn only sign below the stop sign would be helpful.	C: offers more traffic lanes & gets bikes and pedestrians off of roadway.
18	Improve the safety and flow of traffic.	It's obvious the option C is what you want us to pick.	
19	2 lanes in each direction. Turn lanes.	Please minimize cost and timeline. What about the very steep grade?	Alt. C has 2 lanes in each direction and turn lanes so I like it best.
20	-increased center lanes for more traffic -specifically designated turn lanes for safety + flow	A does not increase lanes + B does not have protected turns	Alt C seems like to best mix of increasing flow + making sure turns are safer and don't lock cars behind you
21			Even though it requires more money & land - might as well do Alt C -- do it right the 1st time. We've lived in the neighborhood for 36 yrs & this has been talked about since the '80's, Traffic is only getting worse & there are more accidents.
22			C * but with only bike + ped. Lane on one side C * widen only to the south not north C * sound barriers to the North - Adirondack Neighbors
23	Any improvement in traffic flow would be better than current conditions. The addition of a center median for turns is crucial!	Alternative B does not consider cross-lane turns in an efficient manner.	Alternative C will provide the maximum traffic flow and cross-lane turn capability. We only have one shot at this -- make it count!
24	should enhance mobility + safety		Alternative C 2 lanes Turn-arounds

#	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
25	A way to control an increasing traffic problem		The only reason I prefer B is the [retention?] of the current turn lanes + ability to turn Right + left. If more turn lanes could be added to C or eliminate the barrier I would prefer the C option. C as it currently exists blocks too many [lanes?] + businesses from exiting normally + will back up traffic even more as they try to wait to turn around.
26	Additional lanes + paths	Unsure if Austin Oaks redevelopment is adequately considered	Alternative C
27	Go with Alternative C		
28	First, thanks for having this informative open house. Medians for turning are critical for safety and traffic flows. I can't imagine Alt C with 4 lanes, turn lanes, and bicycle lanes, but that seems to be the best approach given traffic projections for 2027. We do not want to repeat Austin's historical mistaken policy of failing to build infrastructure for the future.	Alt C looks huge - unimaginable given its 2 lanes today and all those trees that would have to be removed. BUT it appears to be the safest and best for traffic flow.	C - see above. Thank you.
29	I didn't like any of them - unfortunately not. Our city is being co-opted by people who are [indcipherable] turn residents x have no [indcipherable] to the community	Many of the people in the neighborhood are longterm residents of Austin + we happen to pay the highest taxes in the city. The city planners have decided to make these so called "improvements" for the benefit of [continues in next question]	[continuation of previous quesiton] people living outside the neighborhood + many not even in Austin. It seems very unerving that the city decides to make these changes to the detriment of longterm residents.
30	I really like the promise of a shorter commute and the added sidewalk + median elements - these still add a lot of neighborhood character to Spicewood but also help the commute.	Main concern would be space needed & when/how construction would take place, and how long this might impact the neighborhoods around Spicewood.	Definitely Alt. C - even though it seems to take the most space from where Spicewood is currently, it takes the most pleasaing elements from Alt. A, adds a pedestrian-friendly sidewalk, and the median looks great.
31	[left blank]	Alternative A seems terrible. Why spend all this money only to have huge traffic problems within ten years? I think pedestrian and bike traffic is low enough that the shared bike/walk path of B and C is fine.	Alternative C looks the best by Far. I like the safety provided by the medians and the traffic flow. Deer could be an issue, but that is problematic no matter what. Even with two lanes, the speed limit should not be too high because of the deer.
32	love4 the bike lanes! love the sidewalks! love the turn lane!	only concern is the temporary hindrance of mobility that comes with the construction - not sure how long that would last, but hopefully not too long.	Would love some combination of A&B - love the raised bike lane and sidewalk, love the two lanes in each direction; don't care about medians so much, but I would love a middle turn lane (if possible)
33	"You call someplace paradise and kiss it good bye"		
34	Alternative C appeals to me as the best for traffic movement with changes. I do not agree with the 2 8' buffer areas on each direction. Could that 18' [or: 1 8'??] be used or incorporated into the median + approach lanes for those making u-turns? Wider median + longer approach lanes.		

#	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
35	Plan B keeps the current turn lanes in front of the office I own	Plan C creates a median and prevents access to my office for traffic heading east. If clients or staff want to leave and go east they would need to exit to turn right or west and then drive to a turn around further down the roadway. This does not make sense when traffic is not heavy and will create more congestion and difficulty when traffic is heavy ie 5pm	Plan B keeps current ability to access my office
36	I like the detail shown in the large presentation slides. These were missing from the handouts.	Each model is very different, and will operate to fulfill different outcomes. Safety and traffic flow are my number one concerns.	Alternative B is my favorite. There are shared paths on each side of the road and two travel lanes in each direction. Much safer for drivers and cyclists, but increased traffic flow for everyone.
37	left turns	Don't close Old Spicewood crossing	Alt C
38	Alternative C is the only one that appears to reduce commute times + provide multimodal improvements. I love the added bike lanes because it is very dangerous to bike on S. S. Rd now West of Mesa	will take a very long time to complete	Alternative C! Multi modal transportation is improved. The big hill on Spicewood Springs is currently too dangerous on a bike.
39	Alt C is best because it provides optimum traffic flow	Intersection @ Spicewood Springs & Adirondack Tr is a problem on all alternatives -- expect high accident rate there for all alternatives. Should consider overpass.	
40	Noise abatement for the neighbors on Adirondack. This is the only residential neighborhood affected. 8546 Adirondack [participant drew a map to the property from Spicewood Springs Road]		
41	I like the room on each shoulder. Nice to consider the ability to turn (turn lanes)	Considering the hill with more traffic the speed is a safety concern. For neighbors along the Spicewood Spgs....NOISE is a concern. Will Spicewood Sp. road be completely closed during construction? (concern)	I prefer A. It doesn't really promote more traffic. Improves safety.
42	Its great to see plans for improvements in this area.	None - they all will provide a benefit. I do not want to see the LWC under 360 @ bull creek closed to vehicular traffic.	Definiately C - it provides the most improvent for LOS and is the safest option
43	Both A+C take pedestrian + hike traffic into consideration. They also add safer options for turning with the medians.	Alternative B - There are no medians in this option. There is a major issue with making turns on the road during peak times and this plan does not offer a solution. Alternative A - one lane in each direction is not enough to accomodate the amount of traffic. No Build - The current situation is not safe. Alternative C - Travel lanes are narrow.	Alternative C has the best combination of features. It makes accommodations for pedestrians and bikers, adds a travel lane, and turning options for residents and local businesses.
44			I prefer A because it encourages non-automotive alternatives. Adding lanes is futile. Witness the 26-lane Katy Freeway.
45	I like Alternative's C since it adds bike lanes along with U-turn bays. I think Alt. B would be a terrible choice due to the lack of a center turn lane	I hope that there is continuity with the bike lanes - both to Mesa and w/360	Alt C due to the extra traffic lanes, left-turn provisions, and bike lanes.
46	I like alternative A the most.	It should include more left turns at the west end of the center median : set of houses 4813-4827 at least.	[left blank]

#	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
47	separated lanes for bike and walkers - good to have them together. medians where you can put them - the more the better images show nice landscaping - be sure it's not grass that needs to be mowed - and be sure the edges are clear of brush that creates wildfire risk	lack of left turn lanes in areas of business on the north, home on the south side of the road	C - much more than the others. However, it needs more protected turn spaces for those going west who need to get to homes on the south side (some new ones coming too) "Michigan lefts" would be great!
48	All three create more space for all types of transportation; standardizes the surface and design of road	Wildlife impact; how changes in the roadway disrupt their migration flow. Are there options to create paths over/under the roadway for an alternative path for them?	C - 1) creates the space above for all types of transportation; 2) has a buffer between traffic with the median/turn lanes but creates 2 lanes in each direction for traffic; 3) has trees/greenery between traffic lanes and the shared use path. A - 2nd choice for above reasons excluding 2 lanes in each direction. I would rather give up lane rather than center median.
49	Per Emily, there will be no "acquisition of land" required. I sincerely hope this is the case especially related to the wildlife, i.e. deer, that cross the road from stillhouse hollow to balcones canyon lands (below ABOR).	I do not wish for this section to look anywhere like what is b/t Mesa & Mopac, including increasing speed limit. My concern revolves around the contract w/APTIM for environmental studies. APTIM is not known for being an environmental company.	Alternative A appears to maintain the integrity and look of the existing roadway. Thanks for this open house!
50	Less gridlock. Better safety. Two lanes. When moving water lines will you please place a large service line on the south side of spicewood springs Road near the access road to our neighborhood? There are 3 water lines under SSR at least one big one needs to be tap-able on the South side of Spicewood Springs Road.	I own the property at 5005 Spicewood Springs Road. The road that accesses our neighborhood is unimproved and been there for more then 100 years. It is easy to miss. this road is highlighted on the attached map. We can have about 20 homes in this neighborhood. There is one house lived in at the far end of this road. There are no other means of access. We MUST be able to get into our neighborhood and out going either direction on Spicewood Springs Road. Please design the curb cut and Turn lanes to provide for 20 homes' worth of traffic	The no Build and option A are bad for our neighborhood due to having just one lane at our neighborhood's only access point to SSR. For options B and C, our neighborhood need access to S.S.R.. Through the Shared Use, Buffer/Tree and gutter.
51	Love the decrease of traffic time w/more lanes Right now the roads are very claustrophobic and feel unsafe, feels like this would be fixed by expanding the street	Concerned about 2-lane plan for Alt. A, doesn't look like a good plan for the future of that area	Alt. C was my favorite. Less traffic, better sidewalks, seems like a good all-rounder. Like the dedicated turn lines
52	turn lanes + two lanes ARE positive water quality is plus	Do not close old Spicewood Springs [written on side, line drawn to this point] use gates instead Everyone knows it is low water crossing. Can't protect everyone from their own stupidity. Some people can't walk or ride bikes.	Option "C" - turn lane Are A must, two lanes a must water Quality are A plus
53	Alternative A causes the most improvement.	A. Does not solve or even address turn issues at most dangerous intersection @ SS + Adirondack Trail, esp. left turn. B, all three alternatives will make this bottleneck worse by increasing pressure + traffic C. closing Old S.S. Road will not solve the traffic from Adirondack + Steck D. Noise abatement? E. Please Preserve existing trees, including curves in Road.	I would encourage cooperation with TxDOT to solve the SSR + Adirondack intersection, even if it reduced the capacity on the rest of the road. One idea is an underpass at that intersection, or an additional access lane on 360 between Old SSR + SSR.
54	medians with trees turn lanes bike + sidewalk removed from road	don't see any grade changes on hill	C - see #1

#	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
55	1	The major concern is that for Alternatives A + C the left turn option for that north/west is just short of the last 2 driveways at the top of the hill. Moving the turn bay/turnaround to match these last 2 driveways would not force the numerous occupants and visitors at 4926 Spicewood Springs to go down Loop 360 every time they need to go left towards Mesa Dr.	I would prefer "A" if the westernmost turnaround was moved to coincide with existing 4926 Spicewood Springs Rd (The last property at the top of the Hill. Otherwise I prefer Alternative B
56	I appreciate that bicyclists and pedestrians have protected pathways, including buffer zones. I am supportive of better pedestrian and cyclist paths, but I'm concerned that there won't be much pedestrian activity because of the lack of homes, schools and businesses along this route.	I'm concerned about having 4 lanes of traffic and then cars making left turns might be paying too much attention to crossing 2 lanes of traffic and not pay attention to cyclists.	Alternative A - I prefer to keep the 2 lanes and not adding any additional lanes. I would prefer if there was also a buffer zone between cyclists and the street in this option.
57	Turn lanes Medians Sidewalks	I am concerned about negatively impacting the environment.	C. I think C provided best option for optimum traffic flow.

Spicewood Springs Road Online Survey Comments

All comments in this section were collected via SurveyMonkey from August 30, 2018 through September 14, 2018.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
1	8/30/2018 10:55:22 AM	The draft alternatives were well-researched, clearly explained, & included safety & traffic impacts.		Alternative C seems to be the most obvious choice as it should improve the flow of traffic & reduce possibilities of accidents. Cudos to everyone involved in this planning & presentation!!
2	8/30/2018 11:02:22 AM	Good presentation. Lots of care evident in the preparation.	As a resident of Neely's Canyon, I'm not enthused about navigating the U-turns in order to travel southeast. However, it is a small price to pay for all the benefits.	C -- it is the only one that addresses both traffic and safety.
3	8/30/2018 12:03:57 PM	The addition of the turn lane and the sidewalk/bike path proposals		I am torn between a and c. I live off Spicewood and I wonder if the 2 lane scenario would increase the amount of through traffic vs alleviating some of the accidents and traffic back ups. At the same time will one lane and a turning lane be enough to eliminate the back ups that happen at the top of the hill heading west?
4	8/30/2018 1:38:46 PM	I like the proposed enhancements for cycling and pedestrian safety.	Do the reduced travel times related to the alternative solutions consider likely increases in cycling, and the resulting reduction in congestion?	Alternative A seems like the safest for everyone, and for vulnerable road users in particular.
5	8/30/2018 2:11:47 PM	Most have 4 travel lanes, which help fix the congestion	Cost of each option	Alternative C is clearly the best option for safety, traffic flow, and appearance.
6	8/30/2018 4:40:44 PM	I like that sidewalks and bike lanes are being discussed since so many people ride 360	They don't include flyovers	B. Since Spicewood Springs is a major arterial with 200-foot right of way, it should be used appropriately.
7	8/30/2018 5:26:24 PM	The inclusion of separate car, bike and pedestrian paths plus trees. Option A is preferred.	Too many lanes and dislike the combined bike and pedestrian paths in options B and C. No trees lining the streets either in options B and C.	Option A - because it would create less lanes of traffic with ample trees to help buffer noise, pollution. And because it separates bikes and pedestrians from one another and from cars.
8	8/30/2018 6:58:38 PM	Bike lanes in both directions; Raised/separated bike lanes could result in less debris in bike lane	Water quality impacts to Bull Creek due to widening road; Is stormwater treatment included at all for Options B and C?	Alternative C, because it is the only alternative that even maintains existing level of service for peak traffic hours.
9	8/30/2018 8:22:16 PM	It offers the chance to make the Spicewood Springs conform with the general design of the road east of Mesa. As well giving cyclists and pedestrians a respite from exposure to vehicles.	I'd think it a mistake to not have a turn lane at Adirondack if alternative B is selected.	I prefer alternative C as it keeps the same number of lanes as exists east of Mesa, and provides a turn lane which will be needed as more development and traffic develops. It also gives a cyclist a chance to turn left onto Old Spicewood Springs Rd., or hold up when crossing from Adirondack.
10	8/30/2018 8:35:41 PM	Its ok, nothing special.	The steep hill on Spicewood Springs Rd improvement plan should be off limits to bicyclists.	The road should be consistent, that is 4 lanes with left turn lanes as appropriate and a center divider. Alternative C is the closest fit.
11	8/31/2018 8:00:28 AM	I like the idea of designing the road to be safe.	I am concerned with a focus in the materials, as presented by Community Impact, seems to focus on "peak hour delay" and "commutes" when most trips are not commute, and safety is such a bigger problem than congestion.	Alternative A.
12	8/31/2018 10:16:12 AM			C - increases the number of lanes for automobiles, while still preserving the ambiance with the median.
13	8/31/2018 10:16:19 AM	I'm so glad you're going to work on this. It gets a lot of traffic and needs improved traffic flow. See #3 below	Alternatives A & C have center medians that would seem to take up a lot of roadway, but I can't see that they would improve the traffic flow much. They also look like more costly alternatives, especially A.	Prefer Alternative B. With 2-way lanes in each direction, it looks like the option that would result in safer, better traffic flow.
14	8/31/2018 10:31:33 AM	I prefer option #3		#3. It offers the most for everybody....2 lanes each direction, pedestrian/bike lanes and the safety of the median

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
15	8/31/2018 10:39:05 AM	Alternative A does not give any more room for cars to add to congestion and smog, while increasing safety and making walking and biking a truly viable alternative.	Alternative B is particularly bad. With no center turn lane, on such a steep hill, there will almost certainly be crashes. Alternative A is the only alternative that improves safety.	A, as outlined above. As an active transportation planner this is clearly the only option that will not induce more driving demand while improving safety for all users. Adding more car lanes is always counter productive, even if members of the community believe it will alleviate their traffic woes. We know that extra lanes only exacerbate traffic problems and it is encumbrance on city planners to educate the public on this well documented fact.
16	8/31/2018 10:43:20 AM	Alternative A, because it gives people an option to avoid car gridlock on Spicewood Springs in 2027, instead of being limited to using a car and making the gridlock worse.	The car-centric way it is presented by rating commuter delay. Alternative A will improve commuter delay for people who are not in cars, but I'm concerned it will be rejected because it looks like it will create gridlock.	Alternative A, because it gives people an option to avoid car gridlock on Spicewood Springs in 2027, instead of being limited to using a car and making the gridlock worse. It also provides more shade for people using the road without air-conditioned cars. Having fewer cars on the road at one time also will make the air better to breathe and improve the comfort and experience for everyone.
17	8/31/2018 1:43:06 PM	Better mixed use services that support multiple forms of transportation (walking, cycling, cars)	Bigger car infrastructure as proposed in B and C can make it more dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians by enabling faster speeds. B and C also mix pedestrian and cycling traffic which can cause additional problems.	A. It has the best support for multiple methods of transportation.
18	8/31/2018 1:56:04 PM	Grade separated interchange at 360. Narrower bicycle/pedestrian corridor.	Closing of Old Spicewood Springs Road low water crossing. That road rarely floods, to the opinion by Watershed is not true. The traffic the low water crossing relieves from the 360 interchange is significant. I do not see how any alternates will address this traffic if the low water crossing is closed. Perhaps Watershed can improve the low water crossing.	The alternate that minimizes impacts in terms of width of traveled way and continues traffic on Old Spicewood Springs Road.
19	8/31/2018 2:00:40 PM	definitely need to do something to improve flow. Definitely not a fan of "no build." Also, dedicated bike lanes and walking are a MUST.	worst option is to make it into a through-road without opportunities to turn. from residential areas. It only gets busy during rush hour, so optimizing for that doesn't make sense.	Alternative C. Turnaround at the Board of Realtors - many residents of Neely Canyon use the unmarked driveway next to the Animal Hospital to head east.
20	8/31/2018 2:00:51 PM	they keep me safer		Choice "A" will result in fewer deaths and suffering

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
21	8/31/2018 2:14:08 PM	I believe that Alternative A is the best solution. I do not believe that combined pedestrian and bike paths are effective. Today I rarely see bicyclists on this road because riding there (or walking) is extremely dangerous with cars flying by you a couple of feet away. Once this road has bike paths and they are connected to the bike paths on 360, there should be a significant increase in bike traffic, primarily consisting of experienced bicyclists riding at speeds higher than appropriate for a shared sidewalk (and likely in groups as well, particularly on the weekends). A second factor to consider is that both sides of Spicewoods Springs Road contain a significant number of residential properties. Widening of the road to four lanes will result in significant new traffic cutting between 360 and Mopac with an attendant increase in noise pollution, and in the evening, light pollution as well. This also leads into the final factor. Your analysis shows better road ratings with the higher capacity alternatives, however, I believe that the increased capacity coming from adding lanes will be completely overwhelmed by increasing regional traffic using the street as a cut-through between 360 and Mopac. This will also result in significant non-local traffic at the intersection of Spicewood Springs and Mesa, an intersection heavily utilized by everyone living both north and south of Spicewood Springs.	I believe that we will be seeing significantly more accidents if we take a four lane alternative as we'll be seeing more commuter traffic rushing to cut through the neighborhood between Mopac and 360.	see above.
22	8/31/2018 2:49:03 PM	Like the median, turn lanes, and even double names. Alternative A could be done, looks less expensive, and if needed years down the road, could be turned into Alternative C, I think it is.	Alternative B & C look expensive, esp. on the downhill. Not sure if there is enough room for the medians and double lanes on each side.	Alternative A for now.
23	8/31/2018 3:04:18 PM	Medians, turn lanes, trees, sidewalks, separated bikeways	Alternative B creates a type of roadway that generally doesn't work well and is dangerous. The lack of turn lanes means the road won't function well for traffic. I find the traffic board odd, as Alternative A should actually have less delay than Alternative B, since the delays along this corridor are related to turning movements, not to through movements (and any delay related to through movements is related to the signal at Loop 360, which will be addressed through the grade separation project).	Alternative A. This alternative provides the safety of a median (prevents head-on crashes and keeps people from making dangerous left turns out of driveways) along with the traffic benefits of left turn lanes. Almost all delay on this street is due to people turning left into driveways, so this alternative fixes that problem. The extra through lane in Alternative C seems overkill, doesn't have as much vegetation, and is too expensive. Also, this option is the only option with separate bikeway and sidewalk. This would be far better for bicyclists and pedestrians than the shared use path option.
24	8/31/2018 3:24:10 PM	Through traffic improvements and turn movement lanes for lefts		C. I like the restricted lefts and u turns
25	8/31/2018 3:31:33 PM	I prefer Alternative C because of the additional capacity and safety improvements it would provide.		Alternative C because of the additional capacity and safety improvements it would provide.
26	8/31/2018 4:59:28 PM	More mobility in an highly congested road.	I live in Spicewood Vista, east of Adirondack Trail immediately north of Spicewood Springs. Our community is very concerned for the elevated road noise as a result of the increased traffic. Sound attenuation efforts/considerations would be greatly appreciated. Expansion of the road toward the south would be helpful as well.	C

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
27	8/31/2018 5:47:03 PM	Love the medians with gaps for left turns Love the separated sidewalks and bike lanes Love the trees	With alternative B, it's going to be really hard to make left turns out of Stillhouse Canyon. It's already sometimes pretty difficult with only 1 lane in each direction. With the alternatives with medians, there's always a risk that someone unfamiliar with the area could go the wrong way in a one-way section. I've seen it happen on the part of Spicewood that has a median.	For selfish reasons, I prefer A because I'd rather have 2 lanes than 4. (I don't have a commute and don't generally have to worry about rush hour.) See my answer to question 1 for the other reasons I like this alternative. If I weren't being selfish and cared about gridlock, I'd pick alternative C.
28	8/31/2018 7:50:51 PM	Improving traffic patterns	Length of time for completion	C. Offers better traffic flow
29	8/31/2018 9:05:48 PM	Center turn lanes and bike lanes.	4 lanes would cause traffic to try and go down the hill to the light faster.	A
30	9/1/2018 8:41:04 AM	middle turn lane; sidewalks	making SS a major cut-through (360 to MoPac) will change the character of the neighborhood forever; we don't want to become another 2222	Alternative A; because it does the least damage
31	9/1/2018 10:50:43 AM	I love the idea of adding bike lanes and two travel lanes in each direction. I also really like the idea of planting trees down the median.	I don't love the idea of medians, from a convenience standpoint, but I can understand them from a safety perspective, so I guess that's alright	I think option C is the best combination of things I'm looking for! I do want to say that I wish this form had a "General Comments" section, because I went to the public meeting on Wednesday and I don't think I got as much out of it as I would've liked. So, on the one hand, I am REALLY glad these resources are available online so I can go through them on my own time, but on the other hand, when I went to the meeting on Wednesday, I spoke to someone whose nametag said "Paul," and I didn't have a great experience. He was standing by the start of the loop of posters, so I asked him whether there was a spiel, whether he could tell me anything about the project, and he said "No spiel. It's all on the posters" (VERBATIM) and then directed me to sit down at the table with comment cards. So that's what I did! I had already been in kind of a rush, thinking I wouldn't have time to look at everything (which is why I asked for an overview!), and so I just followed his instruction and filled out a card based on what I could see from the table. I hand't even gotten a chance to look at Alternative C! And on the one hand I'm just kicking myself for not ignoring this guy (intern?) who, with hindsight, didn't seem to actually know anything about the project. I should've gotten up and figured things out for myself, or tried to find someone else who could answer my questions, even though I was pressed for time. I could've used that time so much more effectively if I hadn't been naive enough to listen to this guy, who, again, seemed like he was actively avoiding talking to or helping people! All this to say, the handout that I was able to take with me was really informative, and I'm very grateful that a PDF of all the posters is available online, because I don't think I would've liked or understood this project as much as I do without those resources. Again, because this guy "Paul" either didn't want to talk to members of the public or didn't know anything about the project to tell them.
32	9/1/2018 2:16:31 PM	Glad to see a proposal for 2 lanes solutions with left turn bays. In particular Alternative C looks the best	The turn from Old Spicewoodsprings Road into Spicewoodspring road is badly engineered. As part of this project I would like to see improvements in the slope (make it less sharp) as well as geometrical improvements to enable cars trying to merge into Spicewoodsprings road towards Mesa will be able to do it more easily at rush hour (7am to 9am)	I prefer Alternative C . Because it provides for 2 lanes, which will be able to cope with the growing population and traffic in the area for years to come. It is a better long term alternatie.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
33	9/2/2018 4:03:38 PM			Alternative C. It has the best traffic and safety ratings and it fits more with the style of the rest of the road towards Mopac
34	9/2/2018 10:54:58 PM	I like option A, because it allow for more trees, and separates pedestrians from bicycles, and separates bicycles from cars.	Option B would be too much concrete and not enough green space. Options B and C have more potential conflict between bicycles and pedestrians.	Yes, A.
35	9/3/2018 10:22:30 AM	Increased separation and options for bike/ped.	No detail on Old Spicewood intersection. Even if the low water crossing closes in the future, the intersection needs help for turns and steep grades.	Alt C. Best for mobility (4 lanes) and good for safety (median/separation). These items are most important.
36	9/3/2018 12:38:44 PM	takes into account multiple needs	want to keep traffic flowing	C seems like the most optimal solution for keeping traffic flowing, safety, and meeting multiple needs.
37	9/3/2018 6:42:59 PM	I like the shared use path for bikes and pedestrians.	I don't drive that road as often as I used to, but 1 lane in each direction seems sufficient to me...	A for the reasons stated above.
38	9/3/2018 10:30:25 PM	What I don't like is bike and pedestrian lanes that will not be used on a hill with that steep of a grade.	That section of road is not appropriate for bike lanes and pedestrian lanes.	I prefer the do-nothing option. I drive that road frequently and it is not experiencing a problem. The city is making a problem where one does not exist.
39	9/4/2018 8:20:13 AM	I appreciate that there is consideration for active transportation.	I have concerns with a thoroughfare having 4 lanes and no turn lane.	Alternative C is my preference for flow and safety, as long as there are considerations for active transportation safety at intersections. Otherwise, Alternative A is safest for those outside of vehicles.
40	9/4/2018 10:07:43 AM	Separated bike lanes and medians in options A+C. Fewer lanes of traffic increase the safety of everyone on the road, so A is the safest. A also emphasizes the importance of other modes of transportation important for the health of a city. (Separated sidewalk/bike lanes)	B just looks bad. No improvement at all.	A. Safest. Shows concern and respect for alternative modes of transportation. Narrow roads are safer and cause slower traffic.
41	9/4/2018 10:57:55 AM	Better turns @ Old Spicewood Springs Rd	Please do NOT close the low water crossing on Old Spicewood Springs Rd! This crossing is open 99%+ of the time, and keeps tons more cars off of 360. Closing this won't improve traffic, it will harm it significantly.	Not sure
42	9/4/2018 11:57:31 AM	Prefer Alternative C. Two lanes in each direction with periodic median breaks should be sufficient for turning traffic and will be better for mobility than a permanent center lane.	I am concerned about the proposal to close Old Spicewood Springs to vehicular traffic. I live on Yaupon Drive near Old Spicewood Springs, and losing the ability to go under the bridge would significantly increase already significant traffic backups.	I prefer C, see above.
43	9/4/2018 1:04:54 PM	I like Alternative C the most. More median reduces the number of left turn locations which should make it safer.	Not shown on the alternatives is the plan for closing the Old Spicewood Springs road low water crossing under Loop 360. That route should not be closed.	C has more median reducing the number of left turn options which should be safer.
44	9/4/2018 1:19:39 PM		Closure of the low water crossing under 360. This is a useful useable road. An alternative to 360 and for emergencies	
45	9/4/2018 7:29:55 PM	I like plan A with center lane but one lane each direction as this will keep cars from going too fast.	My main concern is speed limit. I live at bottom of the hill on Spicewood at Capital of Texas and tailgated when going 30-35 mph. I am concerned if you go to two lanes each direction will higher speeds and accidents at Old Spicewood and Adirondack	I like A with one lane each direction and center lane. More for speed limit issue going up and down the big hill.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
46	9/4/2018 9:10:33 PM	Alternative C looks the best to me	None of the Alternatives address improving westbound traffic flow through the intersection with Loop 360. Instead, there is the implication that Old Spicewood Springs Road under Loop 360 may be closed. This will severely impact travel times both directions for those who use it. In the name of flooding, why not close ALL the low water crossings in the city?	Alternative C has the most productive solution.
47	9/5/2018 4:20:10 AM	Current low water crossings are very unsafe with inadequate road width and no guard rails, resulted in many accidents. Alternatives appear to fix this.	I've driven this route hundreds of times and have only seen cyclists a couple times over the past 10 years. Focus should be on increasing travel lane capacity to eliminate pollution from cars sitting idle in road blocks.	Alternative B seems to address the travel lane capacity issue while also providing a safe shared use path. Let's not be foolish with taxpayer money and make excessive space for cyclist traffic that is never used while increasing traffic jams that result in more pollution and waste (as was done on Lake Creek Parkway, where about 2yrs ago they replaced a travel lane with a dedicated bike lane resulting in constant traffic jams, yet cyclists still use the sidewalk instead of the dedicated bike lane). With option B, in the event we have heavy bike traffic in the future that exceeds the shared use path, we can always convert of the travel lanes into a shared bike path in the future.
48	9/5/2018 12:07:37 PM		Please don't close low water crossing under the Loop 360 bridge, Old Spicewood Springs Road.	
49	9/5/2018 12:26:27 PM		Do not shut down the Old Spicewood Springs Rd. underpass low water crossing. Did the studies on future traffic take that closure into account? Currently when that road is temporarily closed, it has a huge impact on the traffic backup!	
50	9/5/2018 12:34:33 PM	Improvements to spice wood springs look great - including turn lanes and sidewalks	Please do not close the old spice wood springs road (low water crossing!)	No
51	9/5/2018 1:12:15 PM	Alt A seems reasonable	I am not in favor of closing old spicewood springs road. This is an important conduit and a good way to avoid Loop 360.	Alt A appears most similar to current conditions with improved bike lanes.
52	9/5/2018 1:14:18 PM		I see that these is a suggestion to close the section of the road that goes under 360 for "flood safety" reasons. Is there some new risk factor? If the point is that it is a low water crossing and that it is feared that people cannot be trusted to not drive through it during periods of flooding, then I think this is an awful idea. There are many many low water crossings in the area and we need to be treated like the adults we are, not deprived of useful options for our own good. Please do not seriously consider this.	
53	9/5/2018 2:59:31 PM	Closing the low water crossing would greatly increase congestion on old spicewood springs which during rush hour can back all the way to yaupon drive and would back up the light at spice wood dr and 360. This would cause more problems and congestion.		More lanes for vehicles
54	9/5/2018 8:41:58 PM	Not nessessary at this time, traffic will be a lot worse.	Causing more traffic issue than current.	No
55	9/5/2018 8:54:41 PM		Please do not close the Spice wood Springs underpass under 360.	
56	9/6/2018 5:54:29 AM	I like option C	All other option still create traffic stoppage when someone is turning left.	

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
57	9/6/2018 9:55:32 AM	Safer turn lanes without backing up traffic.	You cannot close the underpass by the low water crossing. This crossing alleviates a significant amount of traffic from this light. By closing the low water crossing, you will increase the # of crashes as it is a given the volume of cars passing thru Spicewood and 360 will increase SIGNIFICANTLY. I drive this area daily. For individuals living on the other side of 360, this change would be detrimental to our traffic patterns. There are a great # of low water crossings in Austin. I am not sure why this crossing is being singled out. Please listen to our community. I see that you counted volume at the intersection at 360, but did you account for what will happen if this crossing is closed?	
58	9/7/2018 12:29:15 PM	I'm in favor of widening the road to accommodate cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles.	Actually the only concern is the bottleneck traffic that may result from 360-SSR interesection which is already a 4 minute light. Plus all the cars that run the red lights. Hopefully the construction will minimize the impact. I do agree the low water crossing of old spicewood springs needs to be shut down as it will create a risk to the traffic/construction on spicewood springs road. As a 24 year resident of the area and one who is in this school system - I'm less concerned with people who use the low water crossing (old spicewood springs) for their morning commute than I am about our student drivers, school buses and those that live in our neighborhoods. Commuters can certainly go to the intersection at 360& Spicewood Springs to feed into a line of cars that dictates how traffic will work during the construction.	I'm for Atlternative B or C. Though I have seens cars go in the wrong direction on Spicewood Springs because of the confusion of a median.
59	9/7/2018 12:42:56 PM	Of the three options described, I prefer Option C due to the buffer medians provide as well as turning options. I drive this road both ways, every single day and westbound traffic in the evening is the worst. I believe Option C has the best chance of improving this. However, the project really should included a grade separation (overpass) from Bluffstone to Spicewood Springs as a continuous road, eliminating the need for the stoplight at 360 and improving mobility along Spicewood Springs to Mesa. Making this project scope so small doesn't improve overall mobility. A more effective plan would start at the beginning of Bluffstone and go all the way to Burnet road to alleviate traffic along the entire stretch of continuous road.	I am concerned that funds will be expended to make this incredibly steep hill a cycle/wheelchair/ pedestrian friendly route. Sidewalks are great, but bike lanes are crazy. While I do I see cyclists use this road, it's only the serious cyclists, not people wanting to commute by bicycle. It's too challenging. If there was grade separation and the bike lane was less steep, I would think it would be worthwhile. Right now, it's just for the pro cyclists.	I prefer C, but again, I wish this plan was more holistic and started at Bluffstone and ended at Burnet.
60	9/7/2018 2:04:16 PM	We need something done.	I am concerned with safety for those not in cars.	I want option -3. Sounds safest to me
61	9/7/2018 6:44:23 PM		I am opposed to closing Old Spicewood Spings under 360. The infrequent need to close due to flooding does not justify its closing.	
62	9/7/2018 6:46:14 PM		I do not like that the part of Old Spicewood Springs Road that goes under 360 is being considered to be closed permanently. There is a great deal of traffic that uses this part of the road to avoid the current lines on Old Spicewood Springs Road. This is a terrible idea!	

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
63	9/7/2018 6:50:39 PM		I use Old Spicewood Springs road a great deal. The road under 360 is hardly ever flooded - and I see no reason to close it permanently. This will add considerably to the congestion on 360	
64	9/7/2018 7:08:45 PM	If they close the low water crossing on Spicewood Springs, the traffic at the 360 signal turning left will be horrendous, unless they lengthen the time of the green light. Right now it only lets through 3 or 4 vehicles.	Ooops, see my concern on draft 1	no
65	9/7/2018 7:33:29 PM	I think they all sound ok.	I don't want the part of Spicewood Springs under 360 closed!	No. Just don't close our access under 360!
66	9/7/2018 9:16:25 PM		I don't think you should close Old Spicewood Springs under 360. It's a very commonly used route especially during commute times, and the flooding is very infrequent.	Alternative B.
67	9/7/2018 9:17:47 PM	Nothing.	- Alternatives A and C feature median and leave very small left turn / turn around bays. Turning left on Spicewood Springs from the apartment complexes and businesses in increased traffic would become a lot more challenging. - Alternatives A, B, C bring little improvement but are sure to disrupt the lives of the Spicewood Springs community through lengthy and noisy construction, leaving the street treeless and worse ecologically.	No Build. It is my preferred alternative and is the only alternative that considers and respects the interests of the Spicewood Springs community.
68	9/7/2018 9:19:05 PM	No Build is considered as an option.	- Alternative B will result in more dangerous road conditions. Currently, most drivers do not obey the posted speed limit of 30mph and this would only become worse if the second lane is added. Instead, speed bumps should be added and current lane number should be preserved similar to Mesa Dr.	No Build. This option preserves old trees, lawns, is safer for residents and their children, and rightfully limits through traffic to highway like routes of 2222 and 183.
69	9/7/2018 9:20:11 PM			No Build Best for the Community!
70	9/7/2018 9:21:12 PM			No Build.
71	9/8/2018 12:57:03 AM	The plan is fine except for the proposal to. Lose the road that passes under loop 360. I've used this road for the past 26 years and have only very occasionally seen a need to close it due to flooding. This is spending tax money to fix a nonexistent problem.	Don't close old SpicewoodSprings low water crossing	Draft 3 appears to be complete. 2 lanes each direction. Turning lanes. Median
72	9/8/2018 7:21:58 AM	I'm a fan of No Build. There's already a lot of traffic on Old Spicewood Springs Rd but it's all neighborhood traffic.	If you build 2 lanes each way, it's likely to bring additional interest in building a hotel in that area.	No Build
73	9/8/2018 7:27:02 AM	Alternative C, continues Spicewood Sprngs nicely with the same aesthetics as the East side connection, Mesa Drive.	single lane solutions are risky in given the slope of the road going up and down (E & W),. Not mentioned in the drafts is the latest buzz about disabling Old Spicewood Springs Road, maintenance of that connector should be a priority as it brings people close to the beauty of the Bull Creek waterway and reminds us of what Austin is about.	alternative C, 2 lanes all the way, shared use path, nice median congruent with Mesa Drive designs and the safety curb where there is no median.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
74	9/8/2018 8:43:23 AM	I don't.	The road needs to stay open. Safety issues are addressed, and road is closed when it needs to be. There will be MORE harm if it's closed, due to traffic backing up.	No.
75	9/8/2018 9:13:25 AM	I like the ideas of the left bay/turnarounds	I don't want Old aspicewood Springs Rd to close. It a charming little drive under 360 which gives access to the river and lovely walking trails and only occasionally floods.	Alternative A
76	9/8/2018 9:44:16 AM		Please DO NOT close Old Spicewood Springs Road that goes under 360. This is such a convenient bypass of the traffic on 360 for the 99% of the time it's not closed for water over the road.	
77	9/8/2018 10:27:07 AM	Nothing.	People turning left off of Yaupon onto OSSR already have a tough time during morning and evening rush hours. If that area is closed, I can't imagine how hard it'll be. In addition, that area rarely floods. This is Texas. I've lived off of Yaupon 25 years and what we have now works for most people. When we first moved here, if the bridge was covered with water you couldn't get out of the neighborhood at all!	Not feasible, but if OSSR was four lane it would flow better.
78	9/8/2018 11:01:58 AM	I like nothing about them.	It is ludicrous to consider closing the Bull Creek road under 360. If it weren't for that road, the wait to get out of our neighborhood would be ridiculous! As it is now, about every 4th or 5th car turns to go under 360, easing up the congestion on Old Spicewood Springs trying to get thru the light at 360.	I do not like ANY of the drafts. Where is the alternative to check if you want NO CHANGES!
79	9/8/2018 11:11:12 AM	I wholly disagree that action is needed. Flooding rarely happens and when it does, the city uses metal gates to prevent passage. Again, only occurs infrequently. However, permanently closing it will greatly impact citizens by forcing even more traffic onto already impossibly congested roads (183 and 360), plus cost the city millions of dollars in changes which the users of the road state is unnecessary.	Unnecessary expense for the city when the users of the road state that no changes are needed. Instead, spend the money improving 183 or 360, which are so congested that drivers are looking for alternative options.	None
80	9/8/2018 2:37:03 PM	not much - it's fine like it is	closing the road under 360 will increase traffic on 183 and Jollyville road	no build - there are more road projects that take priority over this one - like Anderson Mill
81	9/8/2018 3:07:01 PM	adding bike and and sidewalks paths for cyclists and walkers.	Adding too much traffic for a residential area. Very worried about increased heavy truck and commercial use of road. I live in the area and I'm not concerned about commuter drive thru times. SS road should NOT be changed to a major secondary throughfare.	by far alternative A. It adds much needed bike lanes and still keeps the neighborhood feel of a country road. I'm not worried about PM traffic congestion. I feel the 360 improvements will keep traffic moving despite your simulations. If traffic gets too bad, commuters will find alternate routes - especially since many intersections on 360 will be modified for increased flow.
82	9/8/2018 6:45:05 PM		The closing of Old Spicewood Springs at the low water crossing under 360 permanently would already add to the congestion on 360 in this area. Many people use this route simply cross over to the other side of Spicewood Springs Road. The road already back up at least two miles, so most of the travelers would probably add to the traffic on 183, 360 or Burnet Road to get to and from work.	

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
83	9/9/2018 9:16:54 AM	Any alternative is fine so long as it does NOT involve closing the low water crossing under the Loop 360 bridge, Old Spicewood Springs Road. That is a heavily traveled road. Closing it would merely back up traffic from Mesa to Loop 360--exactly what happens when it closes due to flooding.	See above. No build is better than closing the low water crossing under the Loop 360 bridge, Old Spicewood Springs Road. Had I known that was a consideration/possibility, I would have voted against the bond proposal.	see above
84	9/10/2018 9:07:46 AM		I live on the Northeast intersection of Adirondack Trail and Spicewood Springs Road. In the mornings I cross over Spicewood Springs Road to get to Old Spicewood Springs Road, and I am worried that if Spicewood Springs Road becomes a two lane road, I would no longer be able to safely cross over the intersection.	Draft A. It provides turn arounds all while keeping single lanes on each side. This allows traffic to feasibly cross the intersection of Spicewood Springs and Adirondack Trail.
85	9/10/2018 9:44:13 AM	I live that alternative B provides the most direct and unencumbered traffic flow	I am concerned about closing Old Spicewood springs road	Alt.B seems the most straight forward and highest capacity
86	9/10/2018 11:41:35 AM	Improvements are necessary for businesses along Spicewood springs (center turn lane or the turn arounds)	The Watershed Protection Departments/Loop 360 Project's recommendation to close the low water crossing under 360 to vehicles should not occur. Neighborhoods west of 360 that use old Spicewood Springs Rd rely on this route to access central Austin - flooding issues are rare.	Alternatives that reduce potential future case LOS impacts (Alt C then B). Do not support making improvements that include center medians and separated shared use trails that don't address the LOS problems.
87	9/10/2018 6:32:29 PM	increased lanes for traffic, and median turn lane	I feel that the 114-120' width is excessive, and many businesses will lose parking lots or the business location itself. The hill is very, very, very steep. I have never seen anyone actually walking up or down it. Very steep for bikes as well. Advise one asphalt bike lane only. (people can walk there if they choose, but, NOT HAPPENING.	alternative C, but drop the excessive double sidewalks and bike lanes. (one bike lane OK) Never understood the term about water quality elements- I assume it means trees in the median?? That will be nice, as long as it doesn't block visibility!
88	9/10/2018 10:13:18 PM	bike and pedestrian access	Excessive traffic and road noise. 2 lanes will lead to increased traffic speed despite speed limit signs making it more dangerous.	A - One lane each direction + bike and pedestrian is a great solution for this area.
89	9/11/2018 5:51:10 PM	alternative A is okay without raised bicycle and sidewalk	alternatives a and b seem overbuilt not really a biking or hiking roadway. doesn't need ped or bike traffic too dangerous.	Overbuilding this stretch of dangerous road for peds and bikes is a recipe for disaster. too many peds being hit and killed in ATX in recent years! a free better turn lanes but not a bike or ped friendly area like 2222. from one who drives carefully here almost daily@@
90	9/12/2018 6:43:14 AM	The alternatives are trying to address traffic flow issues on this stretch of the road.	1. Need clearer understanding of what is meant by "shared use path" on Alt B and Alt C. Does this mean pedestrians, bikes, and cars or just pedestrians and bikes? 2. Need at least two lanes going up hill from 360 due to slow drivers impeding traffic.	Alt C is preferred. Continuing the median division is aesthetically more pleasing, traffic flows better with a physical division, and provides additional safety barrier zone. Alt C provides two lanes each way the whole distance.
91	9/12/2018 6:54:41 AM	Added lanes make sense for future traffic growth in Alternative B.	Alternative B is best option. Other options not enough change for cost/disruption.	Alternative B!!!! Added lanes!!!!
92	9/12/2018 6:58:57 AM	Appears safer and provides more lanes for commuters.	I don't see any projected or forecasted traffic patterns for each alternative. Providing more lanes may change or influence traffic at peak times for better or worse.	Alternative B seems the most reasonable.
93	9/12/2018 7:02:40 AM	Please, whatever you do, do not build two lanes. People speed horribly as it is and there are many deer already being hit & pedestrians (it's near many churches & schools). I'd say leave it as is or Alternative A if you absolutely must change something. Please don't add another lane to increase traffic & speed in a residential area.	See above. Two lanes would increase traffic and speed and there are already too many deer being hit and would endanger pedestrians (there are many churches and schools here).	No change or Alternative A. See above for why.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
94	9/12/2018 7:08:18 AM			Alternative A because it doesn't turn Spicewood into a highway. There are green spaces as well as places for people to turn. Great solution
95	9/12/2018 7:19:22 AM	The proposed improvements to bike lanes.	Environmental impact of road construction in a sensitive area.	The "No Build" plan. Low cost, minor improvements without major impact.
96	9/12/2018 7:22:19 AM	I like the four lanes, designated left turn lanes, and the medians. (Alt. A & C)	Raised or separated bicycle lanes may work for some, but for my type of riding, they are a disaster. I had to dodge two cars in one intersection at 3rd & San Jacinto because of separated bike lanes among other issues.	A with wide outside lanes or real bike lanes.
97	9/12/2018 7:23:43 AM	Too many deer for either B or C and a safe way needed for pedestrians to cross at both ends, near Mesa from about Nealy and crossing Adirondack to Old Spicewood -	Making this a major cut through is further cutting in half Northwest Hills with more traffic at Mesa and Spicewood for the Anderson kids to contend with - keeping to two lane with an island in the middle makes more sense or it will be a speedway as folks gun their vehicle to pass going up and down that hill and for sure their will be collisions with wild life.	A because it appears to be only two lanes - the island green space is a safety area for anyone trying to cross and it keeps it less like a major highway
98	9/12/2018 7:27:07 AM	Raised bike lanes	Shared use paths are glorified sidewalks that put bikes in danger of right hooks by inattentive drivers.	Alternative A, no shared use path, left turn bay to alleviate traffic.
99	9/12/2018 7:36:49 AM	I like draft C. Yep lanes. Bike lanes and sidewalks. And turn around.	Draft B looks stupid. Draft A doesn't allow enough traffic.	C
100	9/12/2018 7:38:13 AM	widen to two lanes, limit left-turn traffic flow issues	may be wasting money and effort on bike trail - since many bicyclists will continue to use the road anyway	C
101	9/12/2018 7:40:55 AM			Seems like the most useful outcome, if the city is going to do anything at all.
102	9/12/2018 7:41:29 AM	Potential sidewalk/bike lanes. Curb separating the directional lanes	Project could go over budget	A due to the single lane in each direction. Two lanes in each direction feels like there might still be accidents due to people drifting into other lanes or cutting each other off
103	9/12/2018 7:49:24 AM	Widening to two lanes in each direction. Also having dedicated sidewalk.	I like the design with medians, but I'm not sure how that will impact business and residents. Would be nice for sidewalk to be further away from street.	I really like 3. Two lanes each direction with median. Maybe that can be used for future expansion and also looks nice.
104	9/12/2018 7:52:37 AM	wider thoroughfare	time	C. Wider thoroughfare.
105	9/12/2018 7:53:06 AM	Minimized cut through traffic through the neighborhood	Allows for more traffic to cut through to MOPAC	Either stay the same or Alternative A. Less opportunity for cut through traffic to/from Mopac
106	9/12/2018 8:09:51 AM	I like that there are options for two lanes for the whole section. I feel that would really help with traffic, especially at peak times.	Construction time and delays along the road since I work right where there will be construction.	Alternative C. It has two lanes in either direction and multiple turn bays which would help alleviate traffic when people are waiting to turn.
107	9/12/2018 8:12:48 AM	Alternative A is the best with Bike lanes and sidewalks. The others will just encourage more speeding through the neighborhood	They will increase speeds through the neighborhood and encourage more cut through traffic	Alternative A for its protected bike lanes and sidewalk
108	9/12/2018 8:15:05 AM	I like the extra lanes but mainly the turn bays and walking paths.	B doesn't seem to bring in any turn bays really. People are going to use the Rd so make it more than we need.	I prefer c. It adds the bike paths which is important and the turn bays at Adirondack which is huge.
109	9/12/2018 8:15:36 AM		All of them are going to build a huge road through the hills between Mesa and 360, certainly leading to more development along that road and even more traffic. Leave the road as is, it's OK for some areas to not have a superhighway running through them.	I would prefer no build.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
110	9/12/2018 8:22:09 AM	2 lanes	no real change with option a, Option B is the best for businesses	Option B, we do not need grassy median, plus it makes it harder for workers in this area to exit the parking lot
111	9/12/2018 8:23:35 AM	Two lanes....Needed this years ago.	Must have 2 lanes. Throw option A in the trash.	Option B. I am concerned about exiting my office (across from the Animal Hospital) and being able to turn left into the Westbound lanes. My coworkers need a safe way to cross the (2) Eastbound lanes and merge into the (2) Westbound lanes.
112	9/12/2018 8:29:38 AM	I like that there are spaces for turning - because it's hilly and curvy, that makes the road safer for everyone. It's a good idea to have a place for bikes, too.	It looks like maybe there's only space for either two lanes or a protected bike lane? Would be ideal to have both.	C, because it's got two lanes and space for left-turns. But I wish it also had protected space for bikes, esp because it's such a steep road.
113	9/12/2018 8:35:51 AM	Alternative A blocks cut-through traffic	Alternatives B and C increase traffic through the Spicewood Springs/Mesa intersection which is heavily used by high school students	Alternative A - reduces traffic
114	9/12/2018 8:37:43 AM	Do not widen; want ROW for bike lanes, pedestrian activity, bus	Less focus on cars	N
115	9/12/2018 8:38:46 AM	It's clear that someone is trying to fix a problem.	How much of an impact does Alternative C have on neighboring properties? The existing medians are nice but are they nice enough to require more area from the surrounding properties?	Alternative C, mainly because of the conservation of existing medians. I'm sure any of Alternatives A - C will improve traffic flow.
116	9/12/2018 8:42:22 AM	Good morning.. My name is Ken Riley and I live very close to this intersection and I am a cyclist - I ride virtually every day in the area but have NEVER ridden Spicewood to 360.. As is, that would be CRAZY.. I do ride Adirondack a lot and so there is a path to that area that avoids virtually all traffic. That said, improving the experience for both cars and cyclists on Spicewood shows a big step forward for the city of Austin. What do I like about the draft alternatives? Alternative A, I like the raised bike lane and sidewalk. Separation is good - in this instance; provides safety with separation. Alternative B is a step in the right direction, but doesn't seem sustainable. Alternative C.. I like the idea but it is not very clear - to me - on the safety/separation of the shared use path but it certainly looks like the most sustainable option of the 3.	I think there has to be 2 lanes for car traffic coming up the hill so I see option 1 as a temporary band-aid. Living in this area, I know that this road is important and needs a REAL "fix".. It seems that option C really is the only one that goes far enough to be sustainable.	Oops.. See above.. Option C seems to be one we can live with going forward. If we choose either of the other 2, we'll just have to come back later and fix it again. Thanks for your time.
117	9/12/2018 8:44:40 AM	more room for cars that PAY TAXES	too much allowance for bicycles	B no wasted median space
118	9/12/2018 8:53:06 AM	It's safer		C. It provides for pedestrian and cycling safety while also increasing the total # of lanes AND it has more places for turn arounds and left turns.
119	9/12/2018 8:53:42 AM	I like that the plans are looking at expanding to two lanes to handle traffic and considering safety when someone wants to make a left turn into a business or apartment complex.	I am worried that the left turn bay/turnaround will not be wide enough for safety. I'm also worried that without medians, people will still make left turns from the left turn lane rather than using the bay/turnaround.	I prefer C, because it has both two lanes and left turn bay/turnarounds. I feel like that will help answer both traffic flow and left turn safety concerns.
120	9/12/2018 8:57:26 AM	Safer than what we have now.	The thought of more traffic -- but it's already here, so I'd rather improve what we have.	C -- it matches what we have before Mesa on Spicewood Springs, plus if we don't improve throughput now -- it's just going to get worse. Divided roadway is safer as well.
121	9/12/2018 8:58:14 AM	I think all of them help address the flow and safety of the road way. I am a big fan of a dedicate medium because it will provide a spot for people to stop when crossing the street (I know that they should not but they will). I also like the positive effects that a median will have for drainage. I would prefer option three of all the options.	I think alternative B will lead to increased speed on the road and the least productive in terms of safety.	Alternative C - drainage, pedestrian and bicycle safety, traffic safety.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
122	9/12/2018 8:58:41 AM	Some have two lanes! It's always a headache to get behind a car that is too slow or needing to turn left!	The construction phase will be difficult. That is a well travelled road.	C. It has two lanes both ways and turn around bays. Those are necessary when there has been an accident. Please keep in mind how slick those roads become in wet or icy weather.
123	9/12/2018 9:02:24 AM	B and C provide some big improvements - 2 lanes all the way, and turnarounds, for example	Cost, traffic disruption and effect on businesses along Spicewood - our financial advisor and accountant have their businesses there and we worry they will relocate	C is safer, as divided roads keep the facing lanes apart
124	9/12/2018 9:07:59 AM	I like that they all provide viable options for the road and feel any of them would be beneficial. Making Spicewood Springs more bicycle and walking friendly would be awesome.	N/A	I like draft C because it seems like it takes the good pieces of A and B and combines them together.
125	9/12/2018 9:09:24 AM	Address issues	Traffic flow during construction	B
126	9/12/2018 9:09:53 AM	I like the raised bicycle lane and sidewalks in alternative A.	I think the raised bicycle lanes and sidewalks are the safest alternative.	Draft alternative A is my preference because it is the safest for all.
127	9/12/2018 9:10:33 AM	two lanes	space for bicyclist to safely ride	alternative c
128	9/12/2018 9:10:38 AM	Increasing the number of lanes to two lanes in each direction is very important for traffic flow as density increases in the area. Also, the dedicated path for bicycle/walking is crucial to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety.	The concern would be the impediment of traffic during the construction phase and ensuring that there is enough room for the multiuse path.	I like draft c because it provides increased lanes, left hand turn lanes, and a walking/cycling path. I also like the dividing medians between the two direction traffic.
129	9/12/2018 9:27:59 AM	Any plan that provides protected pathways for cyclists and pedestrians is welcome.	A center lane for turning may suffice given the traffic on the road gets congested for only 2-3 hours a day.	The one with the raised pedestrian and cyclist paths
130	9/12/2018 9:30:05 AM	Separate Bike/Vehicle Lanes and dedicated Left turn lanes	B does not have dedicated left turn lanes.	C, seems to be safest and most efficient. I know it will prob cost more, but I think it is worth it.
131	9/12/2018 9:32:07 AM	Much needed expansion is being addressed.	Some drafts are more about form over function. Look pretty but may end up costing tax payers more in the long run (20-30yrs) because of # of lanes.	Like 'C' best. Build and be done. It maximizes the lanes and therefore addresses traffic volume. How many times have roads been built to "A" or "B" only to be dug up 10 yrs late and "C" finally being built.
132	9/12/2018 9:33:39 AM	more lanes, safer turns, better safety for bike riders	the plan b doesn't have turn lanes which seems potentially dangerous	C, it combines 2 lanes in each direction and turn/u-turn areas for better safety and less traffic slow down
133	9/12/2018 9:42:08 AM	The shared use path the entire length.	The left lane turnarounds could cause back ups	Plan C. It has the most lanes and turnaround options.
134	9/12/2018 9:44:01 AM	More lanes allows more traffic flow		C, more lanes allows more traffic, also turn lanes would not be needed.
135	9/12/2018 9:44:42 AM	Possibly elevated bike/pedestrian pathway. I travel this rode every day. There are bikers that go up that hill every day, and it could improve safety.	It doesn't address the biggest problem which is the intersection of 360/Spicewood Springs. There are always accidents at this site, and pedestrians and bikers are at risk crossing this intersection. An elevated (or subterranean) pedestrian walkway would be a great addition to this area. Great Hills residents and Northwest Hills residents could access Bull Creek better/safer.	Option A. I don't believe that the road needs 2 lanes in both directions. It just needs better flow onto 360. The traffic light is ridiculously short for crossing-traffic. On some days, only 5-6 cars get to cross before the light turns red. With 360 traffic at 60mph, there are sure to be deaths from T-bone accidents there.
136	9/12/2018 9:46:48 AM	I like the addition of dedicated bicycle lanes in both directions. I also like the additional lanes to accommodate increased traffic loads. The addition of left turn/turnaround bays is also very important to increase the safety.	I'm worried that the plan won't receive enough public support for the large amount of work that needs to be done.	Alternative C is my preference. It serves the needs of all road users effectively by adding dedicated bike lanes in both directions while still accommodating the increased traffic loads this road needs to support in safe way. I feel like the other plans don't go far enough to alleviate the issues this project is supposed to solve.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
137	9/12/2018 9:54:31 AM	Two lanes in each direction is critical for this stretch.	This hill is so steep that only the most skilled and fit cyclists will attempt it. Please DO NOT waste public money on a new bicycle lane that very, very few will use. Focus on the two lanes in each direction. That will have the biggest benefit.	Alternative B - Very few cyclists will be able to safely scale that hill or safely ride down it. Using public funds to support Alternative A would have very little benefit for the greater community. I drive this stretch every day. We need 2 lanes in each direction, without a doubt. Alternative C looks compelling as well, but strikes me as more expensive. Alternative B would deliver the biggest bang for the buck, which is important to me as a tax payer and commuter.
138	9/12/2018 9:55:31 AM	Having two lanes in each direction.	Bikes are never going to be particularly safe on this road unless they ride completely separate from the traffic. I do not want to sacrifice a lane of traffic for a bike lane that will not get well used.	Alternative C looks best for both cars and bikes.
139	9/12/2018 9:55:50 AM	I like widening the road to two lanes in both directions and providing bike lanes. I used to live and work on Spicewood Spring and it's not a safe road in its current iteration.	My concern is the city will opt to build bike lanes and walkways without widening the road to two lanes going both ways. I'm all for bike lanes but the vast majority of people using Spicewood Springs are driving a vehicle.	Alternative C, with the shared use path and widened two-lane road will accommodate everyone's needs the best in my opinion.
140	9/12/2018 10:19:49 AM	Wider lanes and shoulders.	This roadway has been developed as both a small commercial and residential neighborhood arterial. limiting access and requiring significantly more circuity of travel from many properties changes the whole character of what this roadway is. This is especially troublesome to have the last turnaround/median break way before the top of the hill starts down forcing occupants of the last several properties to either go all the way to Loop 360 every time they leave to go south/east if on NE side or when returning from East if on SW side. Moving the last turnaround to the west past the last driveway at the top of the hill would be most beneficial to a lot of building occupants of both existing and potential buildings. This would not require moving this turn around very far and it would seem that any disadvantage of having a little extra spacing would be more than offset by not forcing several people to go up and down that hill several times a day.	Alternative A (assuming the last turnaround can be moved slightly to the northwest) because it comes the closest to keeping the integrity of the existing road and development along it.
141	9/12/2018 10:21:07 AM	We need two lanes each direction	The road is very steep. We do not need a dedicated bike lane. Very few bikes in the area.	B or C. We need two lanes in each direction
142	9/12/2018 10:22:51 AM	I like it that there are plans to improve bike lanes	I'm concerned that you will end up going with a draft that doesn't have enough improvements for cyclists	Alternative A seems to have a bike lane in both directions, and a sidewalk. As a cyclist, I support that.
143	9/12/2018 10:24:57 AM	Fixing Problems	Left turns are going to be difficult	B, Allows for left turns
144	9/12/2018 10:27:50 AM	The added lanes would be safer and allow for better traffic flow.	The time it would take to implement these changes, but nothing about the alternatives themselves.	Alternative B, I believe would be a good enough change to address some issues on this road.
145	9/12/2018 10:29:05 AM	I only like Alternative B, which increases capacity on the road and still allows left turns into homes and businesses without forcing u-turns for many people.	Alternative A does nothing helpful for auto traffic, but actually makes it worse, as people needing to make a left turn into homes and businesses will have to make a u-turn and a right turn in most cases. It eliminates the chicken/left turn lane, which is very helpful to some left turners today. Better to do nothing than this plan. Alternative C at least increases the roads capacity, but then decreases it by turning a left turn into a u-turn followed by a right turn while eliminating the left turn lane/chicken lane. Alternative B is the best, but could be better by extending the chicken lane to cover all home/business entrances.	Alternative B, which increases car capacity and still gives drivers the ability to make left turns into homes and businesses and keeps the very useful left turn/chicken lane.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
146	9/12/2018 10:33:00 AM	Raised a sidewalk and dedicated turn lane.	We've got to avoid restriping everything so that it looks like there are more stripes and than runways at DFW. Clear signage and no vegetation is important. Xeriscaping is advised.	C
147	9/12/2018 10:36:51 AM	As someone who uses this route 10x a day to get my kids to school, grocery shop and access Mopac, I can see Alternative B as making the most sense. The road is manageable at most times except 4:30-6. I can't see adding cycling lanes for a road that unsafe - same with 2222. I am a cyclist and there are places you can ride safely and not risk lives. I can't see adding that option in lieu of wider roads for drivers for the 10 cyclists a week that want to take the route.	As I stated above, I see a problem with utilizing valuable driver road width for the few pedestrians or cyclists that brave that stretch of road and pitch of hill. It is wild to travel that road between 4:30-6pm weekdays - there needs to be two lanes and wider lanes.	Alternative B with no path makes the most sense financially and in terms of usage. Using funds to add shared use path on a road with a 15% grade doesn't make much sense. You will be spending millions of dollars for 10 people a week that will use them. The road is insanely crazy to travel during rush hour. Put the focus there.
148	9/12/2018 10:41:48 AM			C. It not only increases the number of lanes, but allows for left turns through turn bays.
149	9/12/2018 10:42:16 AM	There needs to be 2 lanes each way, with no median separating them.	I own a business on Spicewood in this stretch (across the street from the ABOR), and putting a median would make it difficult and inconvenient for our patients to turn into our complex.	B - Two lanes are needed and a median would block people from turning into each individual complex/building.
150	9/12/2018 10:47:14 AM	Alternative c	A median would just get in the way	Alternative c. Two lanes both ways will help more cars fit in same area and allow cars to pass turning or slow vehicles
151	9/12/2018 11:00:41 AM	I like option 3.	Option 3 allows the turnarounds needed if traffic backs up on 360. It also allows more traffic flow.	Yes, option3
152	9/12/2018 11:01:53 AM	2 lane roads and dedicated turn lanes	Bike lane from Mesa down/up to Loop 360??? Are you out of your minds. Do you really think many people are going to bike that steep hill? Again, you have wasted a lot of tax payer dollars to accommodate maybe 3 cyclist who can actually physically bike that hill. Stop it with the dedicated bike lanes already. You should be criminally charged for wasting tax payer money with this nonsense.	2 lane roads an dedicated turn lanes.
153	9/12/2018 11:02:09 AM	I like that there are generally 2 lanes on each side and turns lanes being included.	I hope that bicycle infrastructure is being included as it is hard to tell from the small maps.	I like alternative C. It has 2 lanes the entire way, plus dedicated turn areas, which means no dangerous "suicide lane" down the middle. I rarely drive this area, but do bike on it and prefer this setup as I believe it will be safer for cyclists.
154	9/12/2018 11:03:02 AM	It will improve the flow of traffic on a congested road.	Some will disallow myself and other coworkers from turning left into our building.	Alternative B because it allows the left turn.
155	9/12/2018 11:13:13 AM	I like the Alternative Draft C. It appears to be the most forward thinking. We already need changes to this road now. So by the time its finished in 2024 don't you think we will need more adjustments. At the rate this city is growing with all the major players moving and building here. (Like the new new MLS Stadium close to the Domain) we need to have better infrastructure. We are constantly playing catch up, we need to get ahead of the traffic problems. Alternative Draft C has the most improvements. a safe median and turn arounds. bike lane and two lanes both directions	My main concern is if you do one with little improvements by the time its finished it will need more..... never ending, and construction makes things worse. Do it all at once!	See answer One

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
156	9/12/2018 11:14:21 AM	Elimination of single lanes. Addition of shared bicycle/pedestrian lanes.	Destruction of trees. Silt flowing into Spicewood Springs Creek. Speeding, especially when cars go down the steep hill. Damage to caprock on the north side of Spicewood Springs Road. Increases in traffic.	Alternative C. Two lanes. Bicycle/pedestrian lane.
157	9/12/2018 11:15:33 AM	better flow of traffic through more driving lanes/turn lanes; better safety for cyclists through good bike lanes	I don't cycle on the road but I want to ensure that regular cyclists have input on this plan and are fine with the plan that is safest/best for them.	I prefer Alternative C, because everyone gets improvements: more car lanes, good bike/ped lanes, good turn lanes for cars.
158	9/12/2018 11:16:40 AM			Draft B. I like the idea of having two lanes to better move people towards 360.
159	9/12/2018 11:24:01 AM	Alternative C makes the most sense for the long future. Do it right once, so you don't have to re-do it in the future.	Alternative C makes the most sense for the long future. Do it right once, so you don't have to re-do it in the future.	Alternative C makes the most sense for the long future. Do it right once, so you don't have to re-do it in the future.
160	9/12/2018 11:30:54 AM	The added safety for bicyclists	the timing	Alternative A. The city should be promoting alternative transportation by bussing and bicycling not increasing road sizes. We need to get cars off the road not on it. CapMetro needs to increase routes and decrease time frames for getting to your desination.
161	9/12/2018 11:44:16 AM	It will protect left turns on the steep road with no visibility.	The extension to 2 lanes each way may induce high speed from commuter just passing the neighborhood on their eay to loop 1. The intersection of Mesa and Spicewood Springs road is dangerous for the children headin to the high school	A. Left turn. Protected bikers and reduced speed.
162	9/12/2018 11:54:24 AM	I like having four lanes, left turn lanes, bike lanes. I drive this stretch of road every day during major drive times in the AM and PM. Aggressive drivers try to force their way in when lanes go from 4 to 2. At time there are MAJOR traffic jams. Once took me AN HOUR to get from Mesa to Loop 360. (I timed it.)	My main concern is having bike lanes as part of the main road. Traffic moves quickly and it is dangerous for bikes - separated side walks/bike lanes would be safer.	I prefer #3, but would like the bike lanes separated from the main road - people speed - they always have - been driving the road for over 20 years.
163	9/12/2018 11:56:44 AM	choices. pedestrian/bike paths.	should be more for bikes. there's a lot of bike traffic in this neighborhood and on 360 and not much between. This would be a good spot, however steep.	C. two lanes both directions and the least complicated. just needs more bike space.
164	9/12/2018 11:57:19 AM	I like 2 lanes in each direction with a shared usage path	keeping the lanes single in either direction does not help the safety and turning issues that are currently present.	Draft 3 seems to be the best alternative as it extends the 2 lanes on either side all the way down to 360.
165	9/12/2018 12:05:10 PM	I like alternative C because it offers four lanes of separated traffic. Middle turn lanes are dangerous. The medians provide order and safety.	Any alternative without medians is asking for collisions on a heavily trafficked road.	C. It's safer and mirrors the existing stretch east toward Mesa
166	9/12/2018 12:09:02 PM	I like that they expand Spicewood Springs road as it is currently a congested and dangerous road. I like the bike lanes and the median as well.	The only concern would be the time it would take to complete the project	I like alternative c because of the center median and turn/ turnaround lanes.
167	9/12/2018 12:09:50 PM	They widen the road for increased traffic flow and they're safer by removing the sneaky transitions to a single lane	Alternative C is the only option that meets all the needs. Options that don't have two lanes are pointless, and having people turning left blocking a lane is counterproductive and dangerous	Alternative C is by far the best option. You keep two lanes in each direction and have dedicated turn lanes.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
168	9/12/2018 12:17:50 PM	I like Alternative C. Although it will I imagine cost more, if we are going to the trouble and expense, we should provide as much safety and accessibility to the most people from the beginning. Walking and biking lanes are important and this option seems to provide the most access, safely. Good luck and thank you for allowing the neighbors to provide input!!	I think Alternative C provides the most accessibility and safety.	C for the reasons below...most accessibility and safety.
169	9/12/2018 12:19:13 PM	the possibility of additional lanes for people wanting to make left turns.	It is still dangerous for bikes-too many cars and too steep of a hill	C-2 lanes and left turn spots are great-not sure how safe the turnaround bays will be
170	9/12/2018 12:21:13 PM	Increasing traffic flow. relieving congestion at Loop 360.	Too much emphasis on bicycles.	B, it will relive congestion better than A or C.
171	9/12/2018 12:24:22 PM	Nothing. these corridors were supposed to follow NACTO guidelines, literally in the resolution. NACTO guidelines would prohibit a good amount of the bad stuff on this. http://austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=262118 "final design and implementation conforms to the region's most recently adopted transportation plans and recently adopted policies and standards for transportation infrastructure design, including, but not limited to: - applicable National Association of City Transportation Officials standards	-Automobile lanes too wide -numerous driveways necessitate center-running protected mixed use path	No, they're all unsafe garbage that maximize automobile speeds and volume at the safety of an all-ages network. The engineer team should re-read their professional ethics in light of the pedestrians and cyclist homicides this year. #visionzero
172	9/12/2018 12:26:36 PM	safety for those turning left and preventing traffic back up	1 lane with a turn lane prevents back up	Alternative C
173	9/12/2018 12:27:01 PM	I live in Stillhouse Canyon Condos, have for 17 years. I have expected changes, and welcome them. I hope that we accommodate the residents and not just the commuters. I like the draft alternatives with protected left turns into my complex.	As you increase traffic, it will become increasingly difficult to come into and out of my stillhouse canyon condo complex. I want to make sure that there is a safe way to go home and leave. I also want sidewalks all the way to Mesa.	I prefer A and C because they have protected left turns.
174	9/12/2018 12:28:40 PM	Two lanes in each direction (Alternatives B & C)	Will the intersection have a designated lane for going straight through the intersection? I have not seen the proposed left turn bay - that may solve the problem.	C - two lanes AND proposed left turn bays
175	9/12/2018 12:36:08 PM	The options do not limit traffic flow if a car is trying to turn left.	Option B will result in cars turning left from the left lane, which could cause traffic backup / accidents if cars are not prepared to stop.	Option C - this will allow the greatest traffic flow, while also creating a separate turn lane to avoid potential accidents.
176	9/12/2018 12:40:21 PM	Bicycle lanes in each direction and two lanes of traffic.	Making sure bikes and pedestrians are kept safe and with plenty of space	Alternative A because it has a dedicated bike path
177	9/12/2018 12:43:09 PM	Implement Alternative C	NONE - Implement Alternative C	Implement Alternative C - Provides the most benefit.
178	9/12/2018 12:47:17 PM	Two lanes in either direction	We don't need a left turn only for those coming out of ABOR or Stillhouse Canyon. It creates MORE traffic if we have to turn right and then U-turn if we need to exit to the left of either of these places.	B because it avoids the need to turn right and execute a U turn if I need to exit my home towards 360 (Stillhouse Canyon).
179	9/12/2018 12:47:42 PM	I like there there is an option to have a median and keep it at one lane.	I am concerned that two lanes in each direction with no median or left turn lane will cause a more dangerous road.	Alternative A
180	9/12/2018 12:54:27 PM	I like the separate bike and sidewalks plus the median turn-arounds.	If it goes to two lanes both ways, speeding and accidents will increase.	I prefer Alternative "A"

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
181	9/12/2018 12:59:22 PM	Alternative C because this major arterial divided corridor should not stop at Mesa	My concern is that there will be a utility or a slope easement requirement outside of the road right of way and the City will be too scared to condemn land for the benefit of the public.	Alternative C because of the existing traffic and the impending density
182	9/12/2018 1:09:10 PM	More lanes, and lane separation	capacity issues in the future w/ option A	C, 2 lanes throughout, median between directions
183	9/12/2018 1:16:51 PM	Better accommodations for cyclists and pedestrians	Given the sharp grades along this section, mixing bikes and peds is dangerous and not a good solution.	Alternative A is preferred because it doesn't mix bikes and peds in an area where bikes are likely to be moving at a high rate of speed in one direction.
184	9/12/2018 1:19:13 PM	I like the focus on separating vulnerable road users such as people walking and biking from cars. I also REALLY like the medians as that helps slow down dangerous speeding, and will reduce crashes. I also like having a tree zone buffer between the road and the sidewalk. All of these would make it safer and more pleasant to walk and/or bike.	Wow. 13' foot lanes? That is insane, and NOT in keeping with NACTO standards, which are clearly specified in the bond language. I don't know how the city can ignore its contract with the voters which clearly says to use standards for narrower lane width to prevent speeding. I also find it extremely sad that in a time of climate change (see: wildfires, Hurricane Florence, etc) we are still prioritizing "level of service" (for polluting cars) over vehicle miles traveled, and decreasing that. So much for being a progressive city who cares about the environment. Regardless, I bike every day, carrying three kids on a bicycle. The buffer zone between speeding cars in 13' lanes needs to be much larger, or moved to make the bike lane on the inside of the tree zone, next to the sidewalk. The standard for a shared use path is 10', not 8, so scenario C doesn't really work for being comfortable for those biking and those walking. Scenario A is better in providing safety and comfort for both modes of transportation, but the bike lane is still probably too close to the car lane. I don't understand how the no build/Alternative A P.M. westbound commute times can actually be different. They both have the same amount of travel lanes as they do now? I feel like this presentation makes it easy for those who prefer driving to say that bikes are "stealing their lanes" or "slowing them down". What is someone's life worth? Fewer crashes between cars, fewer crashes with people on bikes. Is it worth a slight delay for cars? I would say absolutely yes.	Slightly A because the road does not need to be widened and will just create MORE traffic (see induced demand, it is a known fact). I would modify A to move the bike lane. Medians are awesome.
185	9/12/2018 1:39:12 PM	opens up the road, and should also be substantial for further growth in the area.	Speed, but that is every where here in Texas	Alternative C - again, provides enough for future growth without having to revisit the project too soon
186	9/12/2018 1:47:47 PM	They include bike and pedestrian facilities.	They don't account for the changes in development patterns that would result from these changes. For example, increasing the road to 2 lanes would promote denser development along the road, erasing any mobility gains as more people would be induced to use it.	Option A. It provides the safest path for cyclists, separated from both cars and pedestrians.
187	9/12/2018 2:00:42 PM	Increasing the throughput of this thoroughfare.	Safety for bicycle lanes or shared use path.	Alternative C since it appears to encompass the most features.
188	9/12/2018 2:01:31 PM	Alternative C is the preferred due to the left turn lanes	Alt A will encourage faster driving and no designated left turns could be dangerous.	C due to to turn designated left turn lanes
189	9/12/2018 2:02:13 PM	Two lanes all the way from Mesa to 360	I am concerned about bicycle lanes on a busy and windy road. It seems they are unnecessary and dangerous.	Alternative C. The changes to this road have been needed for 20 years. Alternative C appears to be the most comprehensive and allows left turns to get to businesses on each side of the road and allow better flow of the traffic.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
190	9/12/2018 2:02:56 PM	More bike and sidewalk lanes. More bike lanes is critical to getting cars off the road and improving traffic by shifting commuters to bikes.	I'm not sure if adding more cars lanes with alternative B or C will help with traffic. In many cases adding more lanes/roads simply encourages more people to drive and you end up with the same or more traffic as before. Will there be studies done before deciding to add lanes to assess the potential impact?	Alternative A, because it allows for bikers and pedestrians to be safer and faster without adding in additional car lanes, and because I'm not sure about the efficacy of adding more lanes for improving traffic. I wouldn't want the money spent to build an extra lane in either direction, only to have commuters still stuck in traffic like before. Would be a waste. I think having the turn bays added in is good so that turning traffic does not block cars behind them and can keep traffic moving, although they would have to be long enough so that cars don't end up backing into the main lane. Demand studies should be done to determine that.
191	9/12/2018 2:03:56 PM	I like that expanding Spicewood Springs to two lanes going both directions is being proposed, along with added turn lanes, and a shared-use path for biking and walking. This would best meet our needs in my opinion.	The concerns I have are mostly with "No Build," A, and C... not addressing Spicewood Springs is not an option for me. I both live and work on this road and it can be very dangerous during rush hours times in the morning and afternoon. Not to mention, almost impossible to walk or bike on. Alternative A is not sufficient. It's money not well spent, as there will still be mass congestion, and re-routing traffic to "turnaround lanes" may make the problem worse. I like that a shared use path is being proposed but the vast majority of people that use Spicewood Springs (99%) do not have the option to walk or bike. Alternative C is an improvement with the widened roads but again, large medians and turn around bay will only serve to funnel traffic into bottle neck areas. Alternative B is the only draft worth considering.	Alternative B is by far the best draft alternative at this time, but it's still not enough. Widening Spicewood Springs to two lanes in both directions will help, but their needs to be a middle turn lane so that the inside lanes don't get backed up with commuters trying to turn into their office space. A shared use space is also a great idea to allow people to walk and bike more safely down the street.
192	9/12/2018 2:06:17 PM	I only like Alternative A. PLEASE do not add lanes on Spicewood Springs! I drive it twice a day and it's just not necessary. We would be losing so many trees for very little gain. Not to mention making traffic move faster and much it a less attractive environment.	I'm concerned about the addition of unnecessary lanes on this street. I drive it daily and they're not needed.	Alternative A. It maintains the most trees, doesn't add unnecessary lanes, and provides the safest bicycle and pedestrian lanes. Overall, the most pleasant environment. I live in the area and don't want to see extra lanes of pavement.
193	9/12/2018 2:14:12 PM	That there is some thought being put into it.	I don't see any that equally prioritize multimodal transportation. Where are the protected bike lanes? scooter lanes?	Alternative A looks like it leaves the most options and has a median throughout encouraging right turns and u-turns instead of dangerous lefts.
194	9/12/2018 2:14:52 PM			A - I like the green space and the bike and sidewalk being separate.
195	9/12/2018 2:15:54 PM	Clearly, all three proposed options will improve mobility for the areas. Including decreased commute from east to west and increased safety for commercial and residential access along Spicewood Springs Rd.	Alternative A does not increase traffic capacity from Mesa to 360. Without turn bays, Alternative B has decreased safety for vehicles having to turn in and out of driveways across an additional lane than the existing condition.	As a roadway engineer and resident of the Still House Canyon Condominiums, I believe Alternative C provides the greatest level of service and safety with an additional travel lane and turn bays. However, it does have the largest right-of-way impacts and may decrease driveway turning radii and have impacts for adjacent buildings. The turn bay storage capacity looks small from the conceptual drawings. Hopefully these are designed for the adequate capacity.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
196	9/12/2018 2:23:45 PM	I appreciate that the city of Austin is recognizing a road within the city. However, these drafts do not appropriately reflect the actual usage of this road.	I personally have several concerns for the road proposals considering that I live close to this road, and my job is located on this road. I may sound like I have a unique situation, however, there are many people I know who work and live off this road, and that use this road daily. Considering I have used this road for the past 27 years, I feel as though I know the usage of this road and how the flow of traffic in this area works. The only choice that seems promising, and the only choice that would successfully benefit the people, like me, who live and work on this road, or anyone who uses this road, is option B. Option B provides the correct solutions needed for Spicewood Springs Road, with the exception of the bike lanes. From the examples provided, it doesn't seem like the city of Austin is taking into consideration the steep slope of the hill on Spicewood Springs Road near 360. This hill is so steep that there rarely ever cycling and pedestrian traffic, all cycling and pedestrian traffic is rerouted through the neighborhood, mostly on Adirondack Trail. So, if the city of Austin is considering adding bike and pedestrian lanes/sidewalks, the best placement for those would be on the safer neighborhood streets. Unfortunately the other options (option A & C) show many negative signs of future and potential collisions, as well as road delays, and overall making traffic worse on Spicewood Springs Road. Knowing how this road flows, and the types of people who use this road daily, any form of median will only cause a slew of issues, endless negative backlash, and cost more money for the city in the long run. In Option A, the city is proposing taking away lanes from the current road (seen on the No Build Option), eliminating these lanes would make Spicewood Springs Road more dangerous, especially since these lanes safely aid in the flow of traffic going up the steep hill.	Of the choices given, Alternative B is the most reasonable choice, of helping traffic flow. Spicewood Springs Road is a highly traveled business area that allows large delivery trucks, Emergency vehicles and employees travelling on this road reach their destinations safely. The other Alternative choices only create more issues and more traffic congestion. Having large delivery trucks, emergency vehicles and cars all having to do a U turn to access businesses along this road is a poor design choice and will make Spicewood Springs Road more prone to car wrecks, as well as cause more congestion. I think 4 lanes with a middle turn lane is the best solution for Spicewood Springs Road.
197	9/12/2018 2:28:05 PM	Bike / pedestrian path. Safety improvements.	Whether expanding to two lanes will cause congestion further down Spicewood Springs.	I prefer alternative C because it has both safety improvements and throughput improvements.
198	9/12/2018 2:32:17 PM		In implementing the "Corridor Construction Program," the City Manager shall further emphasize making corridors livable, walkable, safe, and transit-supportive, and aligned with the principles and metrics in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, with goals of reducing vehicle miles traveled, increasing transit ridership and non-vehicular trips, and promoting healthy, equitable, and complete communities as growth occurs on these corridors	
199	9/12/2018 2:38:57 PM	We're doing something about the bike lane issues and safety concerns on this road.	They are not very detailed. It's hard to actually see what's going on. The presented materials are condensed onto two pages and I don't see any numbers. How much do they cost? How long will it take? Any stats on reduction in accidents and increased safety? Why would one choose one over the other?	At first glance I would prefer a protected bike lane each way. A median in the middle with turn around lanes and a completed sidewalk. So C appears to get that done but I can't really tell. I live at 4159 Steck and drive this everyday. I can see Spicewood Springs from my balcony. People are constantly going 50 on that road when it's a 30 mph speed limit. Bikes and pedestrians are not safely walking along. The only bus stop is at Mesa and Spicewood or Mesa and Steck. Many pedestrians are walking a long way up the road towards the bus stop and it's unsafe. Also, can we buckle down and give the road one name? Pretty please it's super confusing to people.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
200	9/12/2018 2:50:03 PM	I travel this area several times daily since I live in Great Hills and work at 4131 Spicewood Springs Rd. Option C is the only option I see that facilitates car, bicycle and pedestrian traffic safety and flow. However even that does not accommodate the deer population in this area which is Heavy!	There is a heavy deer population in this area and that can pose a serious safety issue on any of the options proposed!!	C - it appears to be the safest for cars, bikes, and pedestrians BUT does not address the deer issue! Westbound pm traffic in this area Already backs up even further east than 4131 Spicewood Springs Rd.
201	9/12/2018 3:12:22 PM	It's good that the full range of options are represented. The turn bays would be really useful since my experience is that the road can back up with people left turning into apartments and offices.	Alternatives B and C seem like they have the potential to increase traffic. It's disappointing that nothing is being proposed for the Old Spicewood/Adirondack intersection, to make turning left easier. The shared use paths, bicycle lanes and sidewalks on the steep section of Spicewood seem useless except to a small nice of the population.	I prefer A since it adds the turn bays and doesn't drastically change the road
202	9/12/2018 3:16:07 PM	It offers the possibilities of a fast-moving flow of traffic.	Definitely the sidewalk option. I don't think that would be safe for pedestrians. On the other hand, I don't bike, so that might be actually safer for those that do.	As of now, plan C seems to me is the one that easily directs traffic flow in that area.
203	9/12/2018 3:23:01 PM	Alt. B	Bikes flying down the hill. We do NOT need bike lane or paths. Because the cost vs use is not right. Hardly anyone will walk that hill in a normal Texas day.	Alt B
204	9/12/2018 3:33:53 PM	I would like more bicycle infrastructure.		Alternative C I prefer the shared use path
205	9/12/2018 3:42:10 PM	The bike lanes and sidewalks that are a bit away from the road. I think the left turn bay/turnarounds are better than the existing middle turn lane we have now in front of ABOR and Stillhouse Canyon Condos.	I fear that any of these improvements, by easing some of the congestion, will cause people to drive even faster than they already do down Spicewood Springs, which happens most of the time. People regularly drive 50 to 70mph down this road every day and night. There are a lot of deer and other animals in the area.	I prefer Alternative A, because of the medians in the middle, I feel that this is a safer alternative to having five lanes. I think it will improve traffic flow, but keep people from speeding too much. I also prefer the bicycle/walking path that is further away from the road.
206	9/12/2018 3:44:17 PM	Improvements suggested will address lack of sidewalks, shoulders and safety protections for those who use the roadway.	Concern that aesthetics are compromised. This isn't a freeway and is nestled in a neighborhood- improvements should include trees, landscaping to keep the neighborhood/hills type of feel.	Alternative c- allows for better mobility, but keeps aesthetic qualities of area
207	9/12/2018 3:49:13 PM	Grade separation at 360.		Alternative C. It has more improvements.
208	9/12/2018 3:51:02 PM	Dedicated turn locations and additional lanes.	Haven't see that many walkers on Spicewood Springs, and not sure how to address the downhill speed is dangerous for bikers with traffic in close proximity.	C
209	9/12/2018 3:51:25 PM	The Loop 360 grade separation	Lack of turn arounds if you are on the plan north side and want to go east. Alt A needs another turn around to service the lower half of the road. Alt B appears to have no turnaround provisions until you get to 360 which would be extremely disruptive at the intersection unless you can cross the median beforehand which would also be very disruptive to traffic flow. This would be extremely detrimental on the lower half of Spicewood. Alt C at least has provisions for turnarounds in the lower half of Spicewood but could probably still use another one on the lower half after all the buildings.	C. It has turnarounds and additional lanes.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
210	9/12/2018 3:54:36 PM	I like the proposals with 2 lanes going in each direction. We need consistency from MoPac to 360.	This is a major thoroughfare for my family, used multiple times a day by multiple family members. I'm concerned about what will be available during construction if there is any.	I prefer Alternative B. We need 2 lanes going in each direction but the right of way is constrained and I don't think there is room for a safe bicycle lane. Additionally the bicycle lane that is there today is used frequently due to the steepness of the hill and the potential danger.
211	9/12/2018 3:54:53 PM	Alternative A at least keeps conflict paths to a minimum, but the car lane widths are far too wide and will promote speeding and paradoxically crashes will get worse.	This REALLY doesn't need additional car lanes. It would be far more unsafe. The numerous driveways necessitate a protected center-running mixed use path. The lane width max should be 10' max. You're proposing 13' which will kill people. Understand what you're doing. This road will have a body count every year. The resolution requires using NACTO guidelines, which you seem to have ignored: http://austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=262118	Alternative A at least keeps conflict paths to a minimum, but the car lane widths are far too wide and will promote speeding and paradoxically crashes will get worse.
212	9/12/2018 4:00:52 PM	Alternative C is my choice. If there is going to be improvements they should be the most you can do rather than have to begin again as traffic increases. And the turnarounds would certainly help the left turn problems.	That they are not designed to accommodate future needs with more development and more traffic on the road.	Alternative C is my choice as stated above. The most improvements now rather than additional needs later.
213	9/12/2018 4:06:19 PM	I like the added bike/pedestrian features, as well as the extra lane options.	How they'll impact traffic during construction, and the total cost; specifically how much it'll end up being in our taxes.	I like Alternative "C"; specifically due to the double-lanes in each direction, but also because it incorporates the bike/pedestrian walkway, has what looks like a grassy median, as well as the left-turn/u-turn options.
214	9/12/2018 4:06:42 PM	My vote is Alternative C.		My vote is Alternative C. It provides two lanes in each direction with the most left turn bays/turnarounds which are sorely needed on this stretch of road. There is already too much development and no safe ways to get to it.
215	9/12/2018 4:12:42 PM	Alternative C has 4 lanes total to allow for lots of cars AND it has a dedicated left turn areas. OR Alternative A which isn't as good because it only has 1 lane of traffic, but it has left turn areas. I'm not a fan of Alternative C as it doesn't seem to allow for left turns at all!?!?!?	We need bigger roads everywhere. I support lots of lanes.	Alternative C has 4 lanes total to allow for lots of cars AND it has a dedicated left turn areas. OR Alternative A which isn't as good because it only has 1 lane of traffic, but it has left turn areas. I'm not a fan of Alternative C as it doesn't seem to allow for left turns at all!?!?!?
216	9/12/2018 4:15:25 PM	not much	that it they may not improve mobility but attract even more traffic, thus necessitating further "improvements" for safety down the line	the one that leaves things at their current condition.
217	9/12/2018 4:18:17 PM	The more limited improvements, the better.	They will encourage more traffic and generate additional large development in this mostly residential neighborhood.	Either the first option (3 lanes - 2 plus a turn lane) or nothing at all except sidewalk and bike improvements.
218	9/12/2018 4:35:22 PM	Nothing	Mopacocalypse. Not sure why one of the alternatives was not just a turn lane which would cover a short distance. Bike alternatives have wreaked havoc in the entire city where the concern is for 1% of transportation alternatives which are used mostly for recreation and not necessity for work as with auto transportation.	No - please see answer #2. The city needs to pay more attention to the addition of lights that consolidate traffic to where more cars are in close proximity at high speeds. Development is out of control and was not a consideration when 360 was built. It's a nightmare to say the least.
219	9/12/2018 4:35:56 PM	I like the raised bike lane and sidewalk, but that seems only available in Option A. I do like the thought of the extension of two lanes all the way through, as well as additional turn-around bays.	I would hope that the extension of two lanes all the way through would not destroy the look/feel/country-road feel of Spicewood Springs Road, they way it is now. Perhaps you can't have both.	C, even though it incorporates a shared-use path. I selected C because if you're going to improve traffic flow, really go for it--do the best/most you can (and do it right, first).

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
220	9/12/2018 4:36:51 PM	bike and pedestrian facilities	Why no option for a center turn lane and one through lane each direction?	Alternative C
221	9/12/2018 4:42:28 PM	I think the ideas are great however I'm not sure if the traffic on SW Springs warrants this type of update. \$20m~. I would consider reallocating this funding to 360 or 183.	Even if you move traffic smoother through SW Springs it will still bottleneck at 360 & Mopac. Re Safety - I would not increase the speed limits on this entire section as there is a lot of residential, foot traffic, EMS, and terrain concerns in the area, especially in adverse weather conditions.	Draft C - turning lanes help the flow of traffic.
222	9/12/2018 4:55:43 PM	Center turn lane	Increased cut through traffic speeding through the neighborhood	Alternative A with protected bike lanes
223	9/12/2018 4:55:57 PM	I like the sidewalks. Many people walk along the side of this road and it is very dangerous.	The other drafts concern me because there is no sidewalk going in	A because of the sidewalk
224	9/12/2018 4:57:46 PM	None of them will help with the biggest problem I have when leaving work, which is that it takes FOREVER for an opening in both directions in order to be able to make a left turn onto Spicewood. Options A and C would make things even worse for me, as I wouldn't be able to make a left turn onto Spicewood at all. At least with plan B I would be able to turn left, but it likely wouldn't make it much easier to do so than it is now. THE BEST PLAN would be to add a center turn lane here, instead of making it two lanes in each direction. The center turn lane would make it easier to turn left onto Spicewood, and would prevent cars trying to turn left from Spicewood into a parking lot from blocking traffic.	None of the 3 alternatives will do anything the solve the largest problem faced by trying to turn left onto Spicewood from a parking lot. i.e. None will make it any easier to leave a parking lot and turn left. Alternatives A and C will just make it impossible to turn left onto Spicewood, making the situation worse for everyone working along this section of Spicewood. We need a center turn lane for that. WE NEED AN ALTERNATIVE "D" that has a center turn lane instead of two lanes going in each direction. The center turn lane would prevent cars from backing up behind anyone turning left off of Spicewood, while ALSO making it easier to turn left ONTO Spicewood. None of your 3 alternatives help people turning left onto Spicewood.	B. While it's not what I want (I want a center turn lane), at least it doesn't have a center median which I don't want (because I want to be able to turn left onto Spicewood).
225	9/12/2018 4:58:54 PM	Provision in B and C for two lanes of traffic along the entire stretch of road, thereby eliminating the current bottleneck where the road drops to one lane. In addition, the turn lanes in C will allow all traffic to continue moving when cars stop to make left turns.	Alternative A does not appear to do enough to eliminate the problems on the road as traffic continues to increase. Although there are new left turn lanes, there will continue to be bottlenecks where the main traffic lanes drop to one.	C - additional lanes and the provision for left turn areas
226	9/12/2018 5:07:39 PM	Nothing. Literally nothing. These will NOT solve the problems.	The problem with spicewood isn't that it needs to be 2 lanes in both directions, the problem is it needs a dedicated turn lane in the middle. Too often traffic is backed up because its one lane and everyone has to stop, but making it 2 lanes just means one lane will back up until people start getting out and over into the other lane which is going to cause accidents (especially on that hill).	B is the only one I'd prefer, and only because it doesn't involve building medians in the middle of the road, which is going to make things a mess.
227	9/12/2018 5:16:18 PM	I appreciate the drafts that include the use of more lanes	The turning bays do not seem like great options to me, since it can sometimes be difficult to use them as turnaround on such a narrow road, and because this doesn't mean that the business you are wanting to visit will have a turning bay	#2, because it allows for more turning freedom
228	9/12/2018 5:29:48 PM	Various options. Would be better if there was an outline on the goal(s) achieved in each design and how well it satisfies the intended goal.	No ballpark estimate on cost and timing to implement.	Alternative A. Keeps the road from being a major route and provides pedestrian and bicycle safety.
229	9/12/2018 5:38:24 PM	That they give drivers more options.	Alternative A seems like it would bottleneck and make traffic worse. Alternative B looks dangerous and very ugly. Given these options I'd vote for Alt. C or No work.	I like Alternative C best. It provides drivers options to turn around, has enough lanes while protecting the green space/beauty. Grassy medians make drivers feel safer and help drivers keep calm in traffic when the scenery is nice.
230	9/12/2018 5:40:54 PM	Bike lines will make a big improvement for safety and traffic capacity, yay bike lanes	Ensure that bikes do not have to be on the road, let bikes have a lane here, important w/ grade	A

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
231	9/12/2018 5:41:08 PM	narrowing down to one lane was always an issue for high traffic times... those two lanes merging together is a cause for confusion	Bike Path and multiple lanes are required	Alternative B. It's a good middle ground between what we need and not overspending a lot.
232	9/12/2018 5:48:41 PM	Alternative C		C
233	9/12/2018 5:56:04 PM	More modern design, adequate turn lanes to accommodate the increased development along the road since it was built	Spicewood Springs should not be turned into a major thoroughfare or cut-through from Mopac to 360. It should continue to emphasize local access only.	Alternative A, for the following reasons: - It provides a separate bicycle path rather than expecting bikes to ride next to cars on a relatively busy street. - It provides dedicated turn lanes (turning on a 4-way undivided road, as would be necessitated by Alternative B, is unsafe.) - It has the least impact. - It does not add any more lanes (more lanes would encourage cut-through traffic and further development along the corridor.)
234	9/12/2018 6:22:54 PM	Good ideas - all very different	Don't like 2 lanes in both directions because so many people already speed and pass me on the current tiny stretch of two lanes in one direction going up the hill.	Plan A is the best- would keep traffic slow by preventing the idiots who always speed and pass like they would on plans B or C
235	9/12/2018 6:38:30 PM	I like 2 lanes in each direction.	Alternative A only has 1 lane in each direction.	Alternative C. It has the most flexibility and 2 lanes in each direction.
236	9/12/2018 6:42:41 PM	I like the left turn lanes, turn arounds, raised bicycle lanes/sidewalk.	I am concerned with a bike lane being shared with a regular lane. Some have no improvement in sidewalks	A
237	9/12/2018 7:00:42 PM	Sidewalks and bike accessibility	That you'll prioritize people in cars over everyone else	No build or alt A
238	9/12/2018 7:02:25 PM	I like that the one that includes raised bicycle lanes. Shared use paths are inappropriate for streets like Spicewood Springs Rd according to the city's own draft street design guide, so I'm not sure why they are included in some of the alternatives.	I'm concerned about bicycles being relegated to shared-used paths, where they will have to compete with pedestrians for a narrow ROW. If the city is serious about accommodating people walking or using bikes, they should stop including options that treat humans as less important than automobiles. Also, I don't see anything about transit-only lanes. If a route into or through the city has two lanes in each direction, one of those lanes should be for BRT. We shouldn't be wasting money widening roads when it's known that doing so will make traffic worse, not better. I don't see any indication of crosswalks. I'm also concerned about the treatment of the median. Bays for turning automobiles are specified, but pedestrian islands are not included. The omission suggests the city is less concerned about pedestrian safety than they are about promoting automobiles, which flies in the face of Vision Zero and Imagine Austin.	Alternative A, since it's the only one that treats bicycle users and pedestrians as worthy of their own facilities (though it still prioritizes automobile users).
239	9/12/2018 7:12:48 PM	shared use paths, turn bays	alternative A provides no mobility relief	C, because it has the best impact on mobility
240	9/12/2018 7:48:56 PM	The dedicated left turn bays and turn arounds throughout the A and C designs. The biggest congestion comes from folk trying to get into their apartments and condos along the ridge.	Alternative B isn't going to solve any issues, as the two middle lanes will be stop and go as people try to cross traffic. Others will try to merge around them and cause traffic in the outer lanes.	C (2 lanes each direction with dedicated turns). If you are going to spend the money on it, might as well make it work for the anticipated growth. Better to have it work for 20 years instead of it already being congested the moment it is finished.
241	9/12/2018 7:51:20 PM	Any improvements along this stretch are an improvement!	This is a highly trafficked E-W corridor that will be under construction for years. Unless through traffic is allowed during construction, adjacent neighborhood streets connecting to Loop 360 will suffer tremendous and dangerous traffic increases.	The two-lane two-way alternative will provide maximum capacity and continuity of existing lanes. Why suffer through years of construction for anything less?

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
242	9/12/2018 8:01:24 PM	bike lanes	bike lanes need to be safe and cleaned/swept of debris periodically	A or C
243	9/12/2018 8:06:11 PM	#3 is ideal. Better, safer left hand turns.	Not a fan of the single lane remaining.	#3 and then #1. Safer left hand turns are needed.
244	9/12/2018 8:46:21 PM	Two lanes each direction each way. Safer bike and pedestrian ways. Safer places to turn and to turn around.	The access from Old Spicewood is not addressed well. Many cars go through there morning and evening. The turn uphill onto Spicewood Springs from Old Spicewood is not safe, particularly in wet weather when the steep road makes wheels spin on the turn.	Three - two would be my second vote - because three puts me in two lanes down the hill, makes much safer bike and pedestrian use, and the left turn lanes are safer.
245	9/12/2018 8:47:08 PM	I like that all three of the proposals include accommodations for pedestrian and bicycle/scooter traffic.	There aren't any pedestrian crossings, though i'm not very concerned as there aren't very many destinations along this road at this time. However, I would hope for more commercial development along this road and other roads, and we will regret not having more pedestrian crossings.	I prefer alternative A. I drive on spicewood regularly (though not during peak travel times, admittedly) and I've never felt that the congestion was so heavy i'd want a second lane. I also appreciate the green medians and would not want to trade them for more pavement.
246	9/12/2018 8:49:54 PM	I like that someone is looking into it. Great!	No concerns. I'm glad we have an option to vote.	I prefer Alternative A, because it is the safest for cyclists and pedestrians.
247	9/12/2018 8:54:03 PM	I like having 2 lanes both ways.	The amount of time it will be under construction the traffic will be worse and could hurt businesses on that section of Spicewood Springs.	C seems best because it has 2 lanes both ways with some turn around lanes. If we are going to do this, let's improve as much done as we can during the time it is under construction and the public is inconvenienced. Don't do some and then 5 years later need to do more because of traffic growth.
248	9/12/2018 8:58:13 PM	I like Alternative C. It provides more lanes of traffic to reduce congestion. It takes the least right of way, making future improvements possible.	Very few bicyclists will use this area due to the steep grade. Don't waste the money on a bike path.	Alternative C, see previous answer.
249	9/12/2018 8:58:29 PM	I like the alternative a. Single lane with left hand turn around and separate bike/walk lane. I drive that road all the time and live and work in the neighborhood. It's not a crazy busy road. Keep it a neighborhood road. Please. Not a thoroughfare.	I think Spicewood Springs road is nice because of its country/rural/ neighborhood feel and I hate it to turn into a fast 4 lane highway	Alternative a. I like the single lanes and the left hand turn around and the boulevard look keeps it rural looking. I think the separate Bike oath is safer. It's nearly impossible to bike up it anyways.
250	9/12/2018 9:03:31 PM	I like that the city is working to make the road more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. I see many people walking and biking in the area and have always felt it could be a lot more safe.	That bicycle lanes are added and are made safe.	A. Seems to offer the best bicycle and pedestrian facilities. I would like to see this part of Austin become more walkable.
251	9/12/2018 9:06:10 PM	I like that one alternative provide for cyclists and also give motorist better access via turnarounds.	Two of the three options are UNACCEPTABLE for cyclists.	A, because of the provisions for cyclists and pedestrians and better access for auto users.
252	9/12/2018 9:13:39 PM		Nothing, this is long overdue.	Option B, I know that stretch of road and I don't see the bike lane used enough to really justify the amount of bike/pedestrian space for that section. I think the congestion on that will be getting worse still and we need more space for vehicle throughput. That area is not rapidly densifying so that means traffic through it will go through vehicles instead of on foot/bike.
253	9/12/2018 9:27:58 PM	I like the raised bike lane and sidewalk. I feel that will give visibility to those people for the rest of the traffic. A shared use pathway would need to be fairly wide to accommodate both safely, especially if the goal is more use of it.	There is such congestion and confusion now with the turn/turn around lanes with only 1 lane to pass, that I prefer the two lane alternative. I can't tell from the diagram if Alt C has 2 lanes plus the turn arounds, but that would be ideal. Add the raised bike/walk paths and that's the plan I prefer.	Alt C is preferred as mentioned above, but I would add the raised bike lane/sidewalk from Alt A for added visibility of those vulnerable travelers. 2 lanes both directions, no matter what.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
254	9/12/2018 9:36:18 PM	Alternative C	There needs to be 2 lanes both directions the full length of Spicewood from 36 to Mesa, and allow for multouse paths on both sides.	See previous answers
255	9/12/2018 9:47:44 PM	Alternative A specifically support a separate safe bike lane	none that I can see	A - Dedicated raised bike lane
256	9/12/2018 9:51:57 PM	Protected bike lanes! And street trees.	I'm concerned that bikes could get relegated to the sidewalk. I'd prefer a separate, asphalt path for bikes.	Option A. Nice separated path for cyclists, with a planted median in the middle and a planted barrier. I hope the path would be asphalt, not concrete.
257	9/12/2018 10:04:11 PM	The improve overall road user safety through protected left turn lanes, smoother flow through left turn bays and protected spaces for pedestrians and cyclists.	Two lanes of traffic in each direction will lead to faster speeds and greater hazards for car/car & car/pedestrian/cyclist incidents.	Alternative A: Protects all road users. Smooths flow, protects left turners and keeps the road to a single lane reducing max speeds up & down steep hill.
258	9/12/2018 10:07:36 PM	The medians and turn bays / turnarounds	Concerned about plan B which doesn't include turn bays and turnarounds. I think turn bays are needed to keep traffic from backing up on that road.	C - seems the most likely to address future traffic expansions
259	9/12/2018 10:12:06 PM	4 lanes for vehicles and left turn bay	If citizens of Austin are going to spend \$25M we should be improving the level of service throughout the corridor. The proposed improvements do not significantly reduce travel times, there needs more focus on improving the level of service to A or B. It appears that we need to increase the number of lanes at 360 intersection and make it a 6 lane roadway to achieve improvement in this transportation corridor. Remove shared use paths and make it a car travel lane. The ROW takes seem excessive, reduce the shared paths to one. In general, all alternatives the level of services is unchanged. I voted for transportation improvements that help automobile traffic, city staff is failing to improve the level of service on Spicewood Springs Rd.	I like alternative C, but need to do more improve pm peak. Not happy with the limited change in the level of services, to need to make LOS A or B.
260	9/12/2018 10:19:21 PM	B	cost, time frame for completion, traffic coming through Northwest Hills.	B, simple, 2 lanes both ways. The raised bike lanes is ridiculous. No one is riding their bikes up that hill other than recreational. Bike lanes are empty throughout Austin. Too hot for the majority of the year
261	9/12/2018 10:20:36 PM	Alternative A seems to be the safest option for cyclists and pedestrians. What will be used to control speed and reduce cut-through traffic?	Excessive traffic through a neighborhood at high speeds. It appears the plan is to make Spicewood Springs Road a "highway". In reality, it is a main road through a neighborhood. The solution presented is not getting the traffic onto the correct roads and reducing speed.	Alternative A appears to be the safest option. Cars and distracted drivers sharing the road with bikers and pedestrians is not a good solution.
262	9/12/2018 10:38:58 PM	The turn lane by the businesses would be a great addition. It would allow cars a safe place to wait to turn, while not holding up traffic behind them.	I do not like the option without the turn lane (B). Adding more cars without a way to turn in/out of the businesses would be unsafe.	C. I like that it does not take any lanes away from what is currently there, but does add the turn lane.
263	9/12/2018 10:56:49 PM	Not much. I think "improvements" in Spicewood Springs will increase traffic on adjacent streets, which are already often clogged.	I don't understand why it will take so long. I doubt that I will live to see completion of the project, although I will be driving through the construction for many years.	"No build" would be my preference. Alternative B would seem to make the most sense if anything "must" be done. (And probably should have been done 20 years ago.)

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
264	9/12/2018 11:30:12 PM	Widening the road to two lanes with a mixed-use path makes it possible to have drivers and cyclists on the road at the same time safely	Pedestrians may not be very safe in mixed-use paths if they are not physically separated from the street (raised), and cyclists may not be very safe on a raised surface (turning off the road jeopardises safety)	Alternative B seems like the best option because it does not restrict traffic from turning across lanes. Other options that include a medium restrict traffic to turning at periodic turn around cuts, forcing motorists to u-turn to get to businesses or roads between turn around cuts. This may cause traffic back-up if multiple cars want to make the same turn but need to wait for oncoming traffic to stop flowing. It seems a safer alternative to skip the median and let the left lane be for slower traffic to include those turning across traffic.
265	9/13/2018 2:18:41 AM	They provide more safety for cars. They provide ways for less congestion. They upgrade that section of road into a real road versus a rural neighborhood road, which it has not been for years.	Limitations of using Spicewood Springs Road while the different upgrades are built.	Alternative C. Moved traffic. Safer turns into businesses and condos along the road and actually upgrades the road for future traffic.
266	9/13/2018 3:06:56 AM	I like the inclusion of more left turn/turn around bays, since I travel in this area by car.	I am very concerned to hear the proposal to close the low water crossing for Spicewood Springs Road under Loop 360 and oppose this idea. During the morning commute period, I think closing the low water crossing will result in even more traffic congestion on Loop 360. In addition, Draft B of the proposed three construction options concerns me. Seems like westbound traffic congestion is likely to be quite bad by 2027 with this alternative, which makes me wonder why this alternative has been proposed..	Draft C, because it appears to offer the most relief for traffic congestion by 2027.
267	9/13/2018 3:37:38 AM	the illusion of choice and input?	some of the options don't do much for cyclists	Build plan A seems to provide the most protection for cyclists.
268	9/13/2018 3:37:39 AM	I like how each of the alternatives really try to balance safety/environment considerations with the growing mobility needs. I also like how they take into account the upcoming changes to Loop 360.	My main concern is whether the alternatives have the capacity to handle the inevitable increased traffic demands, especially with improvements to Loop 360. I don't want the fear of increasing traffic by neighbors to drive the no build or Alternative A which I don't think can handle the increased traffic demands and also result in worse traffic in the nearby other arterial roads - thus making the traffic problems even worse.	I prefer Alternative C. I think it does the best job of balancing the needs of additional mobility and still maintaining safety for bikes/pedestrians and environmental/water concerns.
269	9/13/2018 5:42:48 AM	They seem to try to address the main issues for me, the Old Spicewood Springs Road intersection with main Spicewood, the one lane/two lane changes, the lack of turn lanes.	The intersection at Spicewood Springs and Old Spicewood Springs could use a light. If the number of cars will skyrocket with new development, then you will trying to catch up.	A. Because the turning cars are a major problem here and this seems to really address this need.
270	9/13/2018 7:47:09 AM	I don't like using medians similar to further east on Spicewood Springs Rd since there are many curb cuts the medians could cause a large back up for U turns.	The use of medians to control access for both directions on Spicewood Springs Rd, i would like to see turn lanes (chicken lanes) fully extended down Spicewood Springs Rd, the turn lane in front of the new Realtors building has helped tremendously.	They are hard to see at this scale and the extent of each graphic doesn't include the side businesses very well, but from what I can see, draft B seems to be the best since it includes turn lanes rather than medians
271	9/13/2018 7:53:28 AM			B. I would like the freedom to turn left or right in/ out of 4807 Spicewood Springs Road. Medians and turn arounds seem less convenient and dangerous.
272	9/13/2018 8:06:02 AM	I like the option C design.	Safety and traffic flow	Design option C is best
273	9/13/2018 8:29:06 AM	I would be okay with leaving as is or if something must be done, then I would choose option B 2 lanes with no center island	I do not want a medium or island. I want the option to turn left OR right from either side of the road	Option B 2 lanes would be ok, not great I think if you build it they will come. Don't really want all that traffic coming thru. But is an option must be done then option B with the 2 lanes and no center island

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
274	9/13/2018 8:34:41 AM	I think Spicewood Springs Rd is fine the way it is currently.	I am concerned that some of the plans will make access to businesses in the area more difficult.	I would prefer that no improvements be made. If any plans are chosen, I prefer the ones that do not limit the ability to turn into/out of businesses
275	9/13/2018 8:49:38 AM	Love Alternative A! It creates high-quality bicycle infrastructure and gives Spicewood a much-needed road diet, increasing safety. If this happens, it'll set a new high bar for Austin and will set us on the right track for future projects. There should be no 4-lane roads in cities. A road diet to 2 lanes would induce less driving, congestion would not be worsened because behaviors would adjust, and crashes would be reduced. Safety should be the #1 consideration here. Please don't let congestion fears guide decision-making - we know that narrowing roads does not in the long run affect commute times.	Vehicular lanes in Alternative A should be at most 11', not 13'. Please have completely separated and protected bike lanes and sidewalks - mixed-use paths decrease comfort and discourage walking and biking. Please replace Level Of Service as a metric with Vehicle Miles Traveled. We should be encouraging alternatives to automobiles and measuring success that way.	Alternative A. It creates first class bicycling and pedestrian facilities, induces less driving, and increases safety. Austin might do what's right, which doesn't always mean doing what's popular - that's leadership. Please do the right thing! Future generations will thank you for it.
276	9/13/2018 8:51:12 AM	Two lanes in each directions with left turn bays. Dedicated bike and walking lane.	Plan 1 does not seem suitable.	I like three. Traffic can flow with two lanes and the left turn bays.
277	9/13/2018 9:22:46 AM	Multiple lanes, extra turnarounds	Just the construction time and impact on the existing situation during rush hour	Alternative C- seems the most comprehensive, multi lane multi turnaround options for all the apartments in the area.
278	9/13/2018 9:29:31 AM	We need to rethink the ground coverage in light of the Atlas 14 information. The Spicewood Springs area is an EXPANDING flood zone. And, the more ground cover we lose, the more flooding potential.	Under Atlas 14, my home is going from a small corner being in the 100-year flood zone to the ENTIRE home being in the 100-year flood zone. In addition, Starline Drive, which is between Mopac and Spicewood Springs is already at risk of street flooding whenever there are flash rains. We do not have sufficient water catch pool to prevent flooding.	No Build. None of these plans consider the Atlas 14 issue. A few years ago, FEMA classified my house on Starline Drive as having a corner in a 100-year flood zone. At the Atlas 14 meeting last night, I learned that almost my ENTIRE home is going to be reclassified in the 100-year flood zone. The area lacks the drainage systems to handle the loss of further ground coverage.
279	9/13/2018 9:51:41 AM	Shared use paths, multiple lanes, left turn, turn arounds	I wonder if the bike paths will be used, its steep there.	C. Shared use path, median, left turn, turnarounds
280	9/13/2018 10:13:51 AM	I like C the most, as I believe additional lanes will help improve mobility. Also like the addition of median with trees and rain gutters.		C, appears to have least impact to congestion at all times.
281	9/13/2018 10:19:33 AM	I like both alternative A and C, but think C is best. I do believe we need those median breaks to help regulate traffic flows. I know road expansion does make people nervous since it means that Spicewood will become a feeder to 360/Mopac, but looking at the numbers, I think it's unavoidable by 2027 and would rather avoid the congestion when driving home from work.	B might be chaotic when rush hour comes in the future. Making left turns out of my condo to a 2 lane road is not too difficult but as traffic increases, I do think everyone will benefit from having the median	My favorite is C. Expands to accommodate future traffic while adding medians to help add structure to the flow.
282	9/13/2018 10:39:31 AM	Expansion to a two lane road is long overdue	Maneuverability during construction	Alternative B because a median doesn't prevent left turns into buildings on Spicewood - our office is on Spicewood and any of the alternatives with a median would force all of our employees to do a U-turn into our parking lot - thus increasing traffic congestion on the road.
283	9/13/2018 10:42:50 AM	Alternative B - easier traffic flow	Length of construction time. Hard to take left onto spicewood.	Alternative B - easier traffic flow, easier to make left onto Spicewood, option to pass slower vehicles

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
284	9/13/2018 10:43:57 AM	I like Alternative B. I currently live directly behind the Stillhouse Springs Office spaces in the Marquis at Caprock Canyon apartment buildings. I think Alternative B is a good plan because it provides for 2 lanes and thus a better flow of traffic as well as shared use lanes for pedestrians and bikes. I don't think the turn-around lanes in Alternative C are a strict necessity.	How long construction will take and whether it will affect my ability to enter/exit my home.	Alternative B. See above. I just don't feel the turn around options in Alternative C is necessary but I like the 2-lane proposal in Alternative B because I feel as though it will help improve flow of traffic.
285	9/13/2018 10:55:43 AM	I commute and work on this road daily. The road, as it exists right now is too much of a thoroughfare for people taking a short cut through. It is frankly dangerous to walk or ride bikes on. I think at least one of the proposals helps.	While 2 and 3 appear to include bike lanes, the truth is, with as much traffic as you see, going from one side to the other would be impossible. Option one, that has separate elevated bike and walking sidewalks is the safest	option one
286	9/13/2018 11:05:14 AM	No build	No need for four lane road on this road	No build
287	9/13/2018 11:08:23 AM	That attention is finally being paid to this section of the road in general. Widening of the roadway would help with the congestion on the narrow road.	I think that medians would look nice, but would restrict access to businesses that are not in line with the left turn areas indicated I myself would have to drive past my office and use a left turn as a turnaround. This would be worse than what we all put up with currently.	Alternate B. It provides more lanes, without restricting access to any of the businesses on Spicewood Springs with medians. Medians would create more backups for those of us trying to get to our workplaces if we had to use a turnaround to get back to our destination. This seems like the safest option.
288	9/13/2018 11:10:56 AM	It accommodates motorist, cyclists and pedestrians.	My only concern is how long these improvements will last and the affect it has on the local businesses and employees who rely on this road to go to and from work. Would hope this would occur in the evening when there is not as much traffic.	Alternative B, the schematic appears as though this project will take far less time to complete.
289	9/13/2018 11:14:20 AM	I like the widening and the turn around.	Do not want this to become a cut through alternative for people to avoid 183 and Mopac interchange.	C. It widens and creates safe turning lanes for commercial properties.
290	9/13/2018 11:17:59 AM	I would like the draft alternatives to be more reflective of the actual traffic needs for businesses along Spicewood Springs Road	My concern is that the changes will constrict the flow of traffic more, rather than to help the flow of traffic. I think the focus isn't on the fact that this is a highly travelled business area with large delivery trucks, Emergency vehicles and employees travelling on Spicewood Springs. Alternative A and C would cause more traffic issues and reduce the ability for vehicles to access businesses along Spicewood Springs. This would cause more traffic jams and decrease traffic mobility. I have worked in this area for 9 years and have not seen many bicyclist traveling this stretch of road to commute to work. I think the emphasis on bike lanes takes too much of the attention, instead of alleviating the traffic for the many vehicles that use this road.	Of the choices given, Alternative B is the most reasonable choice, of helping traffic flow. The other Alternative choices only create more issues and more traffic congestion. Having large delivery trucks, emergency vehicles and cars all having to do a U turns to access businesses along this road is a poor design and will cause more congestion. I think 4 lanes with a turn lane/chicken lane is the best solution for Spicewood Springs Road
291	9/13/2018 11:21:04 AM	Glad the problem is being addressed	No median, it would cause back ups and dangerous U-turns	B
292	9/13/2018 11:28:48 AM	Alternative B; two lanes each direction would greatly improve traffic flow and allow existing businesses to exit their parking lots going either direction.	How will the traffic flow be diverted during the construction phase???	Alternative B; it provides the best traffic flow without restricting or changing current traffic routes.
293	9/13/2018 11:34:50 AM	painted safety curb and raised bicycle lane	that keeping one lane won't alleviate the traffic congestion	A seems safest, C mitigates most problems

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
294	9/13/2018 11:37:17 AM	I like that there is more consideration for pedestrians and bikes as well as an attempt to ease congestion.	The protected left turn lanes do not extend to the Stillhouse Canyon Office Park. There is a lot of in and out traffic and without a protected left turn and the ability to turn left from the exits will actually increase traffic going east as people have to drive to the turn around bays to go to 360 when leaving the office park, and add extra traffic going west when people trying to access the turn around to get to the office park when coming from Mesa.	No. I would like a combination of options A and C. I like the driving surface of option C if you add a left turn bay/turn around at Stillhouse Canyon Office Park with the raised bike land and sidewalk of A. If no left turn bay/ turn around could be added at Stillhouse Canyon Office Park on option C, than option B with the protected turn pushed out to Stillhouse Canyon Office Park with the raised bicycle lane and sidewalk of option A.
295	9/13/2018 11:37:44 AM	Not much! I have lived and worked in housing and office space off Spicewood Springs Road for over 6 years and all I think is needed is proper maintenance including tree trimming for proper vision on curves and enforcement of the speed limits.	They will encourage more speeding and will not help safety.	No. Would much prefer upgrading the maintenance and cut back trees and shrubs that block vision. The changes should not encourage the use of Spicewood Springs Road as a major traffic way!
296	9/13/2018 11:38:07 AM	I do like the expansion of the lanes, that will help with congestion of traffic for this road.	My concern is that some of the changes will constrict the flow of traffic more, rather than to help the flow of traffic. Alternative A and C would cause more traffic issues and reduce the ability for vehicles to access businesses along Spicewood Springs. The decrease in accessibility to the business' along this road would cause more traffic due to all the commercial vehicles that need access at the time when traffic is the worst. I don't believe pedestrian access and bicycles access will be utilized greatly in this area since the concerns with the steep grade of the hill on Spicewood Springs Rd, it created a dead end for that type of travel.	Of the choices given, Alternative B is the most reasonable choice, of helping traffic flow. Having large delivery trucks, emergency vehicles and cars all having to do a turn around to access businesses along this road is a poor design and will cause more congestion. I think 4 lanes with a turn lane is the best solution for Spicewood Springs Rd which was not a given option.
297	9/13/2018 11:39:53 AM	not very much	I work at the stillhouse and turning left (west) is hairy, but I would need to turn right, go to the turn around. If two/three cars are in the turn around, am I blocking traffic behind me? At times there can be a constant flow of west bound traffic until the light down the street turns red. Just need a turn lane in the middle, not divided barriers	B, no barrier to going left, and middle lane to go into. No barriers for left turn out of work
298	9/13/2018 11:51:37 AM	I like nothing about this. More traffic calming is needed, cars go way to fast here. they should stay on 360, 183, 2222 or MoPac. We should not provide another opportunity for cars to kill pedestrians and cyclist.	Limited ability to turn left, no traffic calming incorporated, no provisions for pedestrians or cyclist to use the road (they don't have options on 360, 183, 2222-- now you are going to add Spicewood --bad on you...)	I don't like any of them. At least option b provides for a way to turn left. The others are just to benefit ABOR's driveway and many people will have to turn to get into homes or offices which will not be safe because these crazy commuters are going 70 on this stretch of road. There needs to be multiple traffic lights!
299	9/13/2018 12:36:15 PM	the turnarounds and dedicated bike / foot paths	cost, congestion during the project	Alternative B
300	9/13/2018 12:36:40 PM	Alt. C. Traffic significantly increasing and will continue to do so. Need two lanes in each direction full length plus center left turn lane west to hilltop.	Alt. A and B will result in one lane of travel in each direction during rush hours since many drivers will be turning left into businesses, blocking/slowing travel.	C for reasons stated above
301	9/13/2018 12:39:52 PM	addition of sidewalk, Alternative A	construction time, traffic disruption, influx of bicycles on that steep hill, but raised sidewalk/bike lane will help	Alternate A. Sidewalks.
302	9/13/2018 12:47:50 PM	I support the no-build alternative.	The proposed alternatives will all have the effect of increasing traffic on Spicewood Springs, which will make it even more difficult for those of us who live on Old Spicewood Springs to turn left.	No-build.
303	9/13/2018 1:02:30 PM	Bike lanes!	Option B is NO GOOD. No way to turn left without enormous risk. 2 lanes in each direction will lead to much more additional traffic, including truck traffic.	Option A. Provides safe way to effectively turn left and has bike lanes. Really don't want or need 2 lanes of traffic. The 360 improvement should help a lot during rush hour.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
304	9/13/2018 1:09:04 PM	Alternative C. We need to build out one time and should do what will improve flow and safety	A&B just delay what eventually will be needed. We can't ignore the growth	Yes C - see above
305	9/13/2018 1:12:29 PM			Option C- makes things easiest in terms of exiting and entering Spicewood Animal Hospital
306	9/13/2018 1:19:40 PM	I prefer option c ... it seems to be the most practical and safe option.	option c looks like the way to go -- no concerns	option c - two lanes each way with periodic left turn passages, also path for bikes and pedestrians
307	9/13/2018 1:38:23 PM	I like the greenery in between the two lanes and the separated bike path		Alternative A, it has greenery in between the lanes and it has the Raised bike lane and sidewalk.
308	9/13/2018 1:55:16 PM	something's got to be done - can't say I care that it has to be done at all	the it will induce more cars to use Spicewood as an alternative route to get from Mopac to 360	B - two lanes consistently between Far West and 360 makes sense. Shifting to one lane is always problematic, causing far longer waits since people don't understand the zipper format
309	9/13/2018 2:02:06 PM	2 lanes in both direction with left turns and turn arounds as well as the median to separate traffic.	Austin drivers will drive as fast as the road allows, endangering pedestrians, wild life, other cars. How will you mitigate the speed, will there be speed mitigation devices such as road humps to slow people down?	Draft C is preferred. Larger number of turn arounds. perhaps will slow folks down some. Going down the hill as Adirondack intersection will be dangerous if high speeds however. How do you propose to slow people down? Can there be stop signs some where in here to slow people down?
310	9/13/2018 2:14:05 PM	Nice to see all the alternatives along with the projected impact on travel times.	There weren't really any bullets surrounding pros and cons of each plan, so if you weren't able to attend the meeting, it requires a lot of conjecture and reading between the lines in order to form an opinion.	I think alternative C is probably the best. It allows for 2 lanes so traffic doesn't back up so much with left turns, and still accommodates pedestrian and bike traffic. I also think medians always improve aesthetics and add greenery to road ways.
311	9/13/2018 2:22:06 PM	Anything that takes into consideration pedestrian and bike options	Prefer one lane each way; two lanes only increase car traffic. Public transportation should be moving more people instead.	A--I think this is the one that keeps one lane each way and gives more room for bikes and pedestrians.
312	9/13/2018 2:30:59 PM	The two proposed lanes in either direction for Alternatives B and C.	Turn bay/turn around need to be strategically placed or it could cause additional back ups.	Alternative C. The bay / turn around provide a safe left turn and may prevent rear end crashes.
313	9/13/2018 2:33:07 PM	Two lanes each direction with lots of left lanes and turn around. Keep old Spicewood Springs road under 360 open all the way.	Too fast speed, how about turn circles to slow down or use speed bumps. need speed enforcement. Adirondack trail intersection is dangerous with high speed down hill	Draft C, left turns good, keep open old spicewood springs under 360
314	9/13/2018 3:10:04 PM	Turn-arounds for cars. Pedestrian/bike friendly.	That the pedestrian/bike features will be overlooked, skimmed on, or unsafe due to budget.	C. Widens road, provides turn-arounds, and appears bike/pedestrian friendly.
315	9/13/2018 3:15:13 PM	More turnarounds	Too many lanes in each direction, it will be much harder to pull out if you work/live on spicewood springs. Especially during rush hours, it will be hard to judge what is safe to turn out into, and what isn't. More wrecks will happen with more lanes to watch for	Alternative A. Only thing needed is more turnarounds/middle lanes.
316	9/13/2018 3:38:04 PM	medians for Alt. A & C	Alt C has "shared" path and I am not informed on the bicycle traffic with a hill incline on the section of Spicewood Springs	A or C because of the medians
317	9/13/2018 3:42:44 PM			C
318	9/13/2018 4:18:33 PM	This road can be busy and need improved infrastructure.	A. seems to be good for the short term. Cars can safely turn around. B. would be a nightmare with cars stopping to turn anywhere haphazardly. C. is the best option for now and future growth as the road continues to be busier and busier.	See above.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
319	9/13/2018 4:18:37 PM	Adding bike facilities is important. My husband does not feel safe riding his bike to work currently. His office is on Spicewood Springs. Adding continuous sidewalks is important. The people in his office would walk to Randalls, but there are not continuous sidewalks at this time.	How do bikes take left turns on this busy road with any of the plans. The plans with the medians feel a little better, but I still have concerns. What if a cyclist doesn't want to try to make a left turn on this stretch and instead uses the light at Mesa to cross. Will they be able to ride on the opposite side of the road? Also, on the two lane options, why is the existing median still forcing people into one lane where there will shortly be two? My husband says he sees people regularly almost merging into each other at that squeeze.	Alternative C because of the medians. Medians feel safer for left hand turn operations.
320	9/13/2018 4:19:15 PM	2 lanes in each direction with turnarounds that would maximize traffic flow	I would not support any proposal that would close Old Spicewood Springs road. Many folks in the Spicewood Springs neighborhoods use that bypass to avoid having to get on 360.	Alternative 3. It allows for the best traffic flow.
321	9/13/2018 4:35:55 PM	Actually nothing.	There is too much emphasis on bicycle usage. Have you actually seen the grade on that hill? Will bicyclists be able to safely stop themselves going down without injury?	None. Start over and do not include mixed use. That grade is too dangerous. Have bicycles use an alternate street
322	9/13/2018 4:56:55 PM	Adding lanes and left turns	Construction traffic and delay of constructions	C
323	9/13/2018 5:14:18 PM	Adding sidewalk/bike path on both sides would be a nice improvement.	Adding in islands in the road? Height of stupidity. Leave it alone!	You've managed to make all of them bad. Just add a bike path/sidewalk. KISS. Don't widen the road just for the sake of putting islands. Money doesn't grow on trees, and wasting on this pointless stuff really ticks me off.
324	9/13/2018 5:35:47 PM	Plan C	Traffic	C
325	9/13/2018 6:24:31 PM			C. Two lanes in each direction plus protected left turn bays.
326	9/13/2018 7:36:28 PM	Safety	How long it will take	Alt C seems to be the safest, but may take the longest to build
327	9/13/2018 9:19:13 PM	I think the No Build option is the best option since it accomplishes the following: 1. Preserves the animal migration across the road without increasing the number of lanes that the deer have to navigate. Dead carcasses on the road will surely lead to more accidents. 2. Widening the road will just be a magnet for more cars to use the road. My experience is that the more road you provide the faster it gets filled up. This will destroy the character of the neighborhood along the road. People will find alternative routes that allows the flow of traffic to be spread out. 3. The introduction of a median and turn lanes as described in the alternatives will force more people who live or work on Spicewood Springs to make more U Turns when they want to make a left turn out of their driveway. This will likely result in back-ups at the left turn lanes as drivers try to execute a U turn into oncoming traffic. This will occur with the two build alternatives which have turn lanes incorporated into them. 4. By building nothing the project can save some \$15-16 Million dollars and redeploy those assets to more deserving projects like fixing the intersections at Spicewood Springs at Mesa and 360 where the majority of the accidents appear to happen. 5. It seems that the expenditure of \$17 million will benefit the people who transit through this area and make life more complicated for those that live on Spicewood Springs Road.	1. The animal migration across the road will be severely impacted with any new construction making the risk of car/animal accidents substantially especially those alternatives that widen the road, thereby increasing the number of lanes that the deer have to navigate. Dead carcasses on the road will surely lead to more accidents. 2. Widening the road will just be a magnet for more cars to use the road. My experience is that the more road you provide the faster it gets filled up. This will destroy the character of the neighborhood along the road. People will find alternative routes that allows the flow of traffic to be spread out. 3. The introduction of a median and turn lanes as described in the alternatives will force more people who live or work on Spicewood Springs to make more U Turns when they want to make a left turn out of their driveway. This will likely result in back-ups at the left turn lanes as drivers try to execute a U turn into oncoming traffic. This will occur with the two build alternatives which have turn lanes incorporated into them. 4. By building nothing the project can save some \$15-16 Million dollars and redeploy those assets to more deserving projects like fixing the intersections at Spicewood Springs at Mesa and 360 where the majority of the accidents appear to happen. 5. It seems that the expenditure of \$17 million will benefit the people who transit through this area and make life more complicated for those that live on Spicewood Springs Road.	I prefer the No Build alternative because: 1. It is safer for wildlife 2. Only a small increase in delay in PM Westbound traffic in 2027 compared to 2017 numbers. It seems like a lot of money to be spent to solve only a relatively small problem. 3. Widening the road will just draw more traffic. 4. Save the money and redeploy the funds to fix intersections of Spicewood Springs and 360 and Spicewood Springs and Mesa where the majority of the accidents occur. 5. Widening Spicewood Springs seems to benefit the drivers who use Spicewood Springs to get across Austin significantly more than the benefit to residents and workers on the affected sections of Spicewood Springs Road.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
328	9/13/2018 9:25:23 PM	Bike options, two lanes, dedicated turn spots	Backing up left lane of traffic for left/u-turns. Eventually having traffic lights installed.	C. Seems most inclusive and able to get us furthest in future before making more changes.
329	9/13/2018 9:58:08 PM	Ability to ride a bike both ways more safely.	Downhill bike lane safety as speed increases and need to merge with traffic to cross 360 arises.	B or C. Both have lanes (not dangerous sidewalks) more suitable for bike traffic. A wide sidewalk uphill (from A) and lane downhill might also make sense.
330	9/13/2018 9:59:17 PM	I didn't like anything about them.	Traffic accidents and wildlife death and change in residential area.	No, leave it the same.
331	9/13/2018 10:00:36 PM	I liked that the draft alternatives had a good range of options.	That No Build has better traffic in 2027 than Option A, which I otherwise prefer.	I prefer No Build and using the money elsewhere. If I had to choose an option, it would be Option A.
332	9/13/2018 10:03:49 PM	They include improvements to sidewalks and bike lanes.	That it seems like a lot of construction for not requiring any additional land. And the impact to the neighborhood and wildlife.	Option A is the least worst but I'd rather have No Build and the city use the money on the fail intersections along spicewood springs rd. This seems like a project meant to accommodate future development than anything else.
333	9/13/2018 10:30:41 PM	Keep the traffic flowing with safety in mind.	that it will work with the plans at Capital of Texas Highway. We don't need another bottle neck down the road.	Yes, the third one. The one with the esplanade and limited left turns and U-turns. It is the best way to keep the traffic flowing and safe and secure.
334	9/13/2018 10:34:38 PM	We need the full corridor to be 2 panes the whole way. Traffic backs up greatly due to the 2 lane area narrowing later to one lane as is today. Secondly it is a nightmare in the one lane section when people need to turn left across it as the person in front of you slam on their breaks with no warning trying to be nice and let some one out but not realizing they nearly caused a 30 car accident. I think having this section divided with extra turn lanes at intervals will make this much safer.	If any option other than option C is chosen it is not doing enough for both safety and mobility. Bike path option is silly. We have lived here for 13 years and between my wife and I have only seen someone trying to bike or even walk that hill a few times. Please don't bother to change anything if you are not going to make the whole 4 lanes all the way through. Anyone who actually lives here and uses this road multiple times a day deserves the construction to be worth it.	Alternative C, we need 4 lanes all the way through and we need divided lanes in the upper part of the road so there are not accidents every day due to people trying to turn across them
335	9/13/2018 10:37:39 PM	I like that options A and C include medians where landscaping can be added. That will make the drive less stressful and more relaxing, with less opportunity for head-on collisions.	They focus too much on Spicewood Springs Road itself. Really the bottlenecks are at Loop 360 and Mopac. Until those are addressed, it doesn't really accomplish anything to make Spicewood Springs wider if it just means cars get to those bottlenecks faster so they can sit there longer.	Alternative A. Make it as easy as possible for casual bikers to bike, so they won't need to use cars for the rush hour commute. Especially in this area around 360, there's already a strong biking culture that would be enhanced by better bike infrastructure.
336	9/14/2018 12:15:19 AM	Bicycle lanes and separation of traffic.	That the selected option may not have good bike lanes	Yes. C
337	9/14/2018 6:42:06 AM	I choose the no action alternative. The area is too environmentally sensitive. Get out of your cars and take transit.	I choose the no action alternative. I find int interesting that you are not divulging that alternative. Get out of your cars and take transit. The city should be spending money on transit, not environmentally damaging road widening projects that will be congested 2 years after you finish them.	Yes, the no action alternative for environmental reasons and because it would be fiscally irresponsible. The road would be at a poor level of service 2 years after completion.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
338	9/14/2018 7:38:59 AM	Planning ahead for improved traffic flows. I like elevating the bike lane and keeping it separated from traffic.	The improvements are only focused on a narrow stretch of that road. Although B & C say they will improve traffic along that stretch, how will it affect Spicewood Springs between Mesa & Mopac? The Spicewood Springs & Mesa intersection is already defined as a "failed" intersection, so allowing more traffic to reach it traveling eastbound sounds like it will worsen traffic there. Also concerned about the medians in Alternative A & C providing more cover for deer and making it harder to see them as they cross the road. Concerned too, about the proposed medians blocking regularly-used turns. The bike lanes and walk lanes going all the way down the steep hill to 360 feel excessive—not sure anyone will use them and they become an expense to maintain.	I prefer B or C. B addresses adding more lanes, while avoiding the medians that I mentioned in the concerns section. That C addresses water quality issues with the medians makes it my 2nd choice. I don't like A or No Build.
339	9/14/2018 8:21:49 AM	I like that it will improve traffic. I know it will take some time, but in the end it will have been worth it.	Construction taking longer than 1-3 years.	Alternative C
340	9/14/2018 8:25:33 AM	i like that traffic would improve	long construction	yes the two lane option
341	9/14/2018 9:20:38 AM			#c or 3; it is best for car traffic, has 2 lanes each way and a turn around in a few places
342	9/14/2018 9:28:03 AM	In alternative A, I like the pedestrian and bicycle paths that are physically separated from the roads.	Alternative A is my preferred choice, but it looks to be the most expensive.	A is my preferred alternative, as it physically separates motor vehicles from pedestrians and cyclists.
343	9/14/2018 9:59:44 AM	Adding useful bike lanes		
344	9/14/2018 10:07:03 AM	Alternative C	more lanes need to get traffic moving, especially with the Austin Oaks anticipated development.	C offer 2 lanes in both direction and protected left turns!
345	9/14/2018 10:07:51 AM	No comment	No comment	Alternative B, because it allows us to turn left into our offices and not have to go significantly out of our way and make a u-turn
346	9/14/2018 10:11:43 AM	Alternative A limits the improvements to single lane each way but includes much needed sidewalk and bicycle lanes.	Alternatives B and C create a potential bottle neck at N Capital of Texas Highway because of the additional traffic at this intersection. Currently, traffic backs up there with the existing west bound lane.	I prefer Alternative A.
347	9/14/2018 10:29:28 AM	Bike lanes would be an improvement on Spicewood but it seems bike lanes might be most useful on Old Spicewood Springs road. Lots of cyclists use this road which, as it is, creates hazards for cars and bikes alike. There is no way to legally pass on this road. However, drivers get frustrated when cyclists are holding up a long line of traffic and will frequently pass on a double yellow, endangering everyone. When a car comes flying around a corner in the wrong lane, there is no shoulder and often the only alternative would be to drive into the creek to escape a head-on collision. This is a disaster waiting to happen.	I do not agree that the part of Old Spicewood that cuts under 360 to Spicewood is frequently closed due to flooding. I have used that cut through about 6 days a week for a year and a half and have only had to choose an alternative route three times in that entire time. Removing that cut through would significantly back-up traffic at the 360/Old Spicewood Road light.	No. My only concerns are the lack of safe bike lanes on Old Spicewood Road and the necessity of keeping the Old Spicewood Road pass-through under 360 open.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
348	9/14/2018 10:30:23 AM	That they each include bicycle facilities. I have ridden this stretch of road in both directions and it is not pleasant or safe in its current configuration.		Option B because it allows more flexibility to easy turn into the businesses along Spicewood Springs without having to make u-turns and double back.
349	9/14/2018 10:31:50 AM		A and C prevent left turns to most of the businesses along the street.	Alternative B is the best. It preserves the ability to make left turns to many of the offices along the road.
350	9/14/2018 10:37:41 AM	That action will be taken to prevent further deterioration of the efficacy of this stretch of road.	That there will be a long period of disruption to an already problematic route.	B. Less need for u-turns in order to reach a destination.
351	9/14/2018 10:56:49 AM			Alt B
352	9/14/2018 11:26:24 AM	Additional traffic lane, Middle lane for turning, dedicated bike lane for safety.	It looks too wide, I don't think people would use a sidewalk on that steep steep hill down to 360. Also, as road is so steep, I suspect low bike usage, so I think one bike lane would be sufficient. I also think there could be some legal difficulties for the city in that bicycles do not belong on unsafe 360, so having a bike lane connecting to 360 suggest that the city approves of bicycles on 360	Proposal C is the best. It prevents future good luck has the extra car lane and middle lane for turning
353	9/14/2018 11:53:59 AM	Question about another alternative to add just one lane - a turn lane down the middle of the existing 2 lanes. With current traffic, the turn lane would solve most problems along the road.	Wondering if improvements like 2 lanes in each direction will encourage additional traffic thru the area.	If I have to choose between the 3 offered alternatives, I will select 'B'. Still would prefer one added lane - a turn lane - and no other "improvements".
354	9/14/2018 12:37:45 PM	I believe that a turning lane is what is required for the spicewood springs road east of 360.	I am very disturbed by 2 things. 1) the recommendation to close old spicewood springs road that goes under rte 360. This bypass road is utilized by many cars for both the morning and afternoon commutes. This is another traffic disaster courtesy of the Austin city leadership. 2) There should be in this plan improvements to spicewood springs rod just west of rte 360. An additional right turn lane needs to be extended from rte 360 to the AT&T building. the morning commute traffic backs up well over a mile every work day. This would be great help having this turn lane and should not cost a lot of money	All of the alternative are lacking. the changes I have recommended should be added to make for a cost effective improvement to this heavily utilized road
355	9/14/2018 1:10:30 PM	i like the widening, the proposed left turn options and turn around options	i am concerned about people having rear end wrecks if there is a turn around on the steep hill. i like the raised bike/sidewalk, too.	I like A for the raised bike/sidewalk, and B/C for the extra space and turn around options.
356	9/14/2018 1:41:34 PM	Multiple lanes, separate bike/pedestrian sidewalks.	Construction time will temporarily exacerbate current problems.	Alternative C. It has everything: multiple lanes each direction, median, left-turn/turnaround opportunities, separate shared use path for bikes/pedestrians.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
357	9/14/2018 1:53:22 PM	Bike lanes are the best aspect of the improvements. Bike lanes on Old Spicewood could provide an even bigger positive impact than on Spicewood Springs, since cyclists on Old Spicewood create an even bigger hazard (for cars and themselves) than those on Spicewood.	The potential closure of the 360 underpass should be a deal-breaker in my opinion. I can't believe this negative aspect isn't being discussed more, since it would greatly increase traffic on the already congested alternate routes and make for much longer commutes not only for the NW Austin residents that rely on it, but for every one else on the alternate routes. I don't agree that it floods frequently either as I've never seen it closed in the almost 2 years I've been using it (almost daily). I think permanently closing it would be a net loss compared to the temporary closings when it floods and maintenance. The underpass is extremely valuable to thousands of travelers a day. From a 2010 Statesman article (https://www.statesman.com/news/local/spicewood-springs-road-closed-for-weeks/uFIGKbuPJx8alsZLRxIPyL/): "That twisting, four-mile stretch of Spicewood Springs is something of a rural oasis, lined mostly with forest interspersed with a few small neighborhoods and small ranches. But it connects to the north with the Great Hills subdivision and other suburban enclaves. A 2005 traffic count, the most recent available, showed 6,700 cars a day, many of them driven by people who use Spicewood Springs as an alternative to crowded U.S. 183." Closing the underpass (without providing an alternative) would be a big mistake.	No one in particular. Again, my main objection is the closing of the 360 underpass.
358	9/14/2018 2:04:40 PM	Consideration for both cars and bicycles, in both directions of travel.	The multiple left-turn or turnaround cuts are FAR more likely to create new dangers than improve safe traffic flow: The incline is too steep to accommodate safe deceleration without causing chain effect on other drivers' reaction times. But 2-lane expansion also inappropriate for this roadway: it's such a short distance that lane-changers will disrupt traffic flow & safety risk.	A - even though it adds 4 left-turn spots, better than expanding to 2 lanes (see above re: added risk). If not A, then B: better 2 lanes than multiple turn cuts.
359	9/14/2018 2:29:35 PM	I like the turnarounds that you've added. I also appreciate having two lanes all the way down. I like the raised bike lane, but would happily give that up for a 2nd lane.	I don't see any lighting. That needs to be addressed as well. Do you have any plans for under 360? That road is a mess and frequently used to avoid the light.	I prefer C because it addresses all my concerns with an extra lane AND a bike lane, both while adding the turn arounds.
360	9/14/2018 2:36:38 PM	I like the introduction of turn lanes.	I worry that Draft A&B fails to address traffic turning left onto Spicewood Springs.	C, turn lanes are important
361	9/14/2018 3:14:25 PM	options	results in major traffic between 360 and mopac,	A ist , B as second. minimizes impact to surrounding neighborhoods and inhabitants. does not make this into a major freeway1!
362	9/14/2018 3:27:00 PM			I prefer alternative C.
363	9/14/2018 3:45:07 PM	There need to be turn lanes, so I like those.	Very concerned if there is no change. Needs the turn lanes.	I prefer C, with 2 lanes each way, plus turnarounds. A second choice is A. But I don't like the others.
364	9/14/2018 5:42:33 PM	The sidewalks and bike lanes and a designated medium along with additional turn and turnaround lanes as noted in Alternatives A and C. No increase in the current 30 mph speed limit.	My home is located on this portion of Spicewood Springs Rd and I worry that too many people just want a 4-lane speedway with no regards to residences and businesses. I also worry about the large increase in roadway width for all 3 alternatives when wildlife crosses the roadway to/from Stillhouse Hollow Preserve to Balcones Canyonlands (south and north). Basically, these citizens are not concerned with safety for all only mobility improvements via automobile.	Alternative A is my choice because: (1) it is the only draft that elevates sidewalks and bike lanes; (2) it is the only draft adding multiple turn lanes and turnaround lanes; and (3) more than the other two drafts it focuses more on SAFETY of drivers, pedestrians and pedestrians walking their dogs, bicyclists and wildlife. Thank you for allowing my input.

#	Date/Time	What do you like about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	What concerns do you have about the draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements to Spicewood Springs Road?	Is there one draft alternative that you prefer? Why?
365	9/14/2018 5:49:58 PM	I like that the road is getting some attention as it is quite well-traveled and is important to a lot of the people in their daily transportation. I like alternative A the best. I do not think that the road needs to be two lanes each way, or it will result in speeds that are too fast for the area. Deer are a big issue and wrecks could be very bad if people have two lanes, because they will go way too fast.	Please, whatever you do, DO NOT close the low-water crossing on Spicewood Springs road. It is an essential way that people get from one side of 360 to the other.	A
366	9/14/2018 6:24:01 PM	It needs to first be considered how roads are used today vs what would be nice to have. It is more often open than not and closing that portion of the road permanently will cause more of an inconvenience.	I have concerns about the road under 360 at old Spicewood springs rd (down along bull creek) being closed to automobile traffic because I use this daily to get my children back and forth to dyslexia intervention and will be for the next 2-3 years and it will greatly impact our commute. There is already so much traffic on 360 and the light at old spicewood and 360 is only timed to let a small amount of traffic through at a time and that cut through to old spicewood on the other side of 360 is being used by so many people that it will create new traffic jams on backroads where people live, as well as, even worse traffic on 360. Closing a road and causing more traffic problems for already an already congested area of Austin is not worth it to deal with occasional flooding.	I don't prefer anything in which the road connecting old spicewood to the other side of old spicewood under 360 is closed to automobile traffic. It will cause more problems than it is worth. It is used so regularly and traffic studies should be measured to determine how much traffic it would add in back roads and how it would impact traffic on 360 at those lights on either side at old spicewood springs.
367	9/14/2018 6:59:19 PM	I like that plan A & C address left and right turns in order to clear this traffic from the through traffic. As well as the addition of shared use paths in all the plans.	The fact that there isn't a center turn lane the entire route such as currently in place in front of 4711 & ABoR	Alternative C because it addresses the left turns not blocking through traffic, has a shared walk and bike path, and has 2 lanes each way in order to appropriately account for the future growth of the traffic along Spicewood Springs
368	9/14/2018 7:07:41 PM	Pedestrian walk moved away from the traffic lanes	widening of road will take land that now makes the roadway a 'neighborhood' rather than an industrial/business area.	Proposal A
369	9/14/2018 7:10:58 PM	Separated bike and pedestrian way	Road expansion is unnecessary and the landscaped medians is wasted space. Instead of expanding entire roadway, provide left turn storage only where needed (not along entire length either through TWLTL or raised median). Minimize expansion of the roadway as much as possible through selective expansion at critical nodes.	I prefer Alternative A but with the following changes: do not create a raised landscape median (wasted space that has to be maintained). In areas where left turn storage is justified, flare the roadway out there to accommodate; otherwise keep the road at two lanes total. I LOVE the separate bike/pedestrian path, but make sure wide enough (8 feet at least) and design it so that it minimizes the slope as much as possible (e.g., switchbacks).
370	9/14/2018 10:21:27 PM	I like the introduction of dedicated walk/bike lanes for people. I like the idea of medians to help with water quality.	I'm concerned about not really understanding how traffic from the Mesa intersection to where this project begins will be handled. It's outside the scope of the project, but ultimately affects it and I wish it were considered.	B seems like the best compromise. I like C but worry about the medians attracting deer and making them vulnerable to cars.
371	9/14/2018 10:33:31 PM	Looks like many of the possible alternatives, including the 'no-build' alternative, have been hashed out thoroughly. The throughput of this section of Spicewood Springs is bottlenecked by other factors such as the failing intersection at Loop 360, and at Mesa, and further on at Loops 1, so this project should not be started even with the design phase until the 360/Spicewood Spgs grade change project is completed.	1. In the late 1990's, COA and TXDOT had partnered to complete this same project, and the design phase was finished by TXDOT, but then in 2001-2 time frame COA decided that there were more urgent arterial priorities, so the project was canned without COA acquiring all the ROW necessary for that project. Have you looked at those plans? Have you talked to the engineers? Will there be an effort made to recycle the previous plans? 2. Strongly object to the contemplated closure of Old Spicewood Springs Rd underpass (listed as a "sister project" on page 13 of the document Spicewood_Boards-083118.pdf). Taxpayers have sunk acquisition and maintenance costs over a hundred years into this segment of the roadway and it should not be closed. 3. Grade changes? There is limited information in the drafts what if any grade changes are contemplated.	"A" seems to offer the best overall trade-off between local and regional needs that can be built within the 16M budget. The other alternatives would cost upwards of 30-40M, considering that the utility relocation alone was estimated to cost several million dollars in the previous of this project. But as stated earlier, the Loop 360 grade change project should be done before this one, so the rush-hour bottleneck at the currently the signalized failing intersection at 360 can be eliminated.

Spicewood Springs Road

Email Comments

All comments in this section were sent to the project team via email from August 29, 2018 through September 14, 2018.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: input for Spicewood Springs Road
Date: Wednesday, August 29, 2018 9:13:54 PM

Hi Emily -

I attended the Open House tonight and noticed on the form a spot to provide input online. Since we had hungry kids I thought I'd take that option, but I didn't see an input spot on the website.

Here's my input:

1) No to option A. For option B I like that it adds capacity by widening the road and adds sidewalks and bike options AND it allows access for all the neighbors that would lose access with an installed median. For option C I like that it also adds capacity, is safer and will look nice if the median adds trees.

2) My concerns..

for Option A - why would we add an alternative that would make problems worse? Just NO! No to one lane without extra capacity added.

for Option B - This seems like a good option because allows access to all residence and business on the road. It has a risk of increased head on traffic or rear-end collisions. Both of these could be reduced with a chicken lane.

for Option C - This is much better than A, but I'm concerned for the poor businesses and residences that can only be accessed by turn around. When traffic is bad, this could easily add an extra 5+ minutes daily to their commute.

Personally I'd like to see a few key stretches with lots of businesses and residences have middle turn lanes for a few small stretches, like near the animal hospital and by the realor building with buildings across the street. Or at least more left turns cut out for them.

3) Of all the options, I suppose I prefer C, but not by much over B. Ideally I'd like to see another version of C that offers more turn opportunities for the businesses and residence in the area. We need 2 lanes, and ideally some separation. But I'd prefer to offer this separation with a middle turn lane, or more turning opportunities so locals don't suffer more headaches from dealing with more traffic.

Thanks for the chance to provide input.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: Re: Spicewood Springs Road Regional Mobility Project
Date: Wednesday, August 29, 2018 9:47:38 PM
Attachments: [SER Water.pdf](#)

Emily,

You might also find the attached exhibit to the Service Extension Request helpful in regards to the location of four of the homes at 5005 Spicewood Springs Road and the water mains.

Do you foresee the right of way for Spicewood Springs Road being widened?

On Wed, Aug 29, 2018 at 9:41 PM [REDACTED] > wrote:
Emily,

This evening I attended the presentation meeting about the Spicewood Springs Road Regional Mobility Project held at Westover Hills Church of Christ on 8332 Mesa Drive. Thank you for having the public display of the current options. I submitted a hand written feedback about the project but want to submit it here in typed form for your records and legibility.

There is a neighborhood that has its only ingress & egress point at 5003 Spicewood Springs Road. The attached file, TravisCAD Map Property ID 423983.tiff highlights this one road that serves the entire neighborhood. This is a private, unimproved road that has been there for over 100 years. If you don't know it is there, it is easy to miss. There is a ranch gate, picture attached, location for mail boxes and not much else beyond trash cans one day a week.

We must be able to get into and out of our neighborhood with the options of turning left or right whether entering or exiting. Please provision for this access and traffic flow for 20 homes. None of your designs indicate any provision for this neighborhood or indicate awareness of this only road accessing the neighborhood.

At present one house is occupied. Four more are in the design and permitting stage with the city. Homes for the remaining lots are not yet designed.


There are three water lines under Spicewood Springs Road, one 24" on the south side plus one 8" on the north side and one 66" that is either in the middle or on the north side. Will you please design the system such that the 8" and 24" lines have access from the south side of Spicewood Springs Road? These are needed for fire hydrants and residential service to our neighborhood. Our Service Extension Request and design are impacted by this road project. See the attached draft of the Service Extension Request "ser3746DRAFT Water.pdf" for more details.

[REDACTED]

[Property Search Results](#) > Property ID 423983 HERCZEG LASZLO for Year 2015

New Search

Account Property ID: 423983 Geo. ID: 0147050104 Type: Real Legal Description: ABS 521 SUR 17 MITCHELL J M REMAINING PORTION OF F G ROGERS 175 AC TRACT & F G ROGERS 75 AC TRACT	Location Situs Address: SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD TX 78759 Neighborhood: XACRE Mapscor: 494Q Jurisdictions: 01, 02, 0A, 2J, 6B, 03	Owner Owner Name: HERCZEG LASZLO Mailing Address: , 5003 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD, , AUSTIN, TX 78759-8425	Property Appraised Value: \$1,000.00
---	--	--	--







5003

WATER AND WASTEWATER
SERVICE EXTENSION
REQUEST FOR
CONSIDERATION

Name: [REDACTED] Spicewood Springs Road	Service Requested: Water
---	---------------------------------

SER-3746	Hansen Service Request Number 578330	Date Received: 10/19/2015
----------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------

Location: [REDACTED] SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD AUSTIN TX 78731-[REDACTED] SPICEWOOD SPRINGS ROAD

Acres: 2.37	Land Use: CONDOMINIUMS
-------------	------------------------

Alt. Utility Service or S.E.R. Number: City of Austin WW SER-3747

Quad(s): H31 H32	Reclaimed Pressure Zone:	DDZ: NO
------------------	--------------------------	---------

Drainage Basin: BULL	Pressure Zone: NORTHWEST A	DWPZ: YES
----------------------	----------------------------	-----------


Flow: (Estimated Peak Hour Flow, Gallons per Minute) 6 GPM	% Within City Limits: 100
--	---------------------------

Cost Participation: \$0.00	% Within Limited Purpose: 0
----------------------------	-----------------------------



<p>Description of Improvements: Applicant shall make a connection to the 8-inch water main in SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD on the south side of the PRV station (PRV No. 92908; Northwest A Pressure Zone). Applicant shall construct approximately 140 feet of 8-inch water main from the existing 8-inch water main in SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD, across SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD then north along SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD to the subject tract as shown on the attached map. Applicant shall also construct approximately 30 feet of 8-inch water main from the existing 24-inch water main (Project No. 87-0035) located in SPICEWOOD SPRINGS to the proposed 8-inch water main as shown on the attached map.</p> <p>NOTES: 1) Sprinkled fire flow requirement of 1,500 gpm provided by Michael V. Reyes, P.E. on 10/02/2015. 2) Automatic sprinkler system must be installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 of the 2012 International Fire Code. 3) A 24-inch in-line valve may be required with Austin Water financial assistance. 4) An 8-inch valve may be required. Valve requirement will be determined at the site plan review stage.</p>
--

<p>Approval of this Service Extension Request is subject to completion and acceptance of the improvements described above and the conditions set forth below:</p> <p>1) Construction of all Service Extensions is subject to all environmental and planning ordinances.</p> <p>2) Service Extensions are subject to the guidelines established in the Land Development Code, Chapter 25-9, Water and Wastewater Utility Service.</p> <p>3) The level of service approved by this document does not imply commitment for land use.</p> <p>4) Public utility lines must meet City of Austin design and construction criteria and must be approved by Austin Water Utility Engineering Review.</p> <p>5) Approval of a site plan that meets the Fire Department requirements for fire control.</p> <p>6) Proposed public water improvements will be dedicated to the City of Austin for ownership, operation, and maintenance.</p> <p>7) Proposed public water improvements must be placed in the public right-of-way or approved utility easements. Utility easements must be in place prior to construction plan approval.</p> <p>8) The approved Service Extension will automatically expire 180 days after date of approval unless a development application has been accepted by the Development Services Department. The Service Extension expires on the date the development expires, or if approved, on the date the development application approval expires.</p>

Prepared By Utility Development Services	Date	Supervisor, Utility Development Services	Date
Division Manager, Utility Development Services	Date	Director, Austin Water	Date



0 100 200 400 600 Feet

 Subject Tract
 100-yr FEMA Floodplain


W. S.E.R. Name: [REDACTED] Spicewood Springs Road

W. S.E.R. Number: 3746

Utility Development Services Plotted 07/07/2015

DRAFT

This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of the property boundaries. This product has been produced by the City of Austin for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



0 10 20 40 60 Feet



Subject Tract



100-yr FEMA Floodplain


W. S.E.R. Name: 5005 Spicewood Springs Road

W. S.E.R. Number: 3746

Utility Development Services Plotted 07/07/2015

DRAFT

This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of the property boundaries. This product has been produced by the City of Austin for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



From: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Spicewood Springs Road Draft Proposals
Date: Friday, August 31, 2018 2:51:00 PM

Good afternoon [REDACTED] – Thanks for your feedback and I will share this input with the project team. Several of the topics you touch on will be determined as we move further into the design phase of the project—how a potential shared use path will be striped, for example. A shared use path would be paved, however.

We are not looking at adjusting speed limits as part of the design process. After project construction is complete, a speed study may be conducted to evaluate the speed limit and whether it should be adjusted to better serve the new roadway design.

As for Alternative A, the intersection configuration you mention at Loop 360 was incorrect as printed at the meeting. We are not reducing lanes, and I can see how the way we striped this in the rendering is confusing. We are working with our designer to update these files.

The existing travel lane widths vary from 10.6' – 14.3' in different sections of the corridor. Proposed travel lane widths for B and C are 11'.

Let me know if you have any further questions.

Thanks again,

Emily Tuttle
Public Information Specialist, Sr.
Austin Transportation Department
512-974-6509

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2018 12:38 AM
To: Tuttle, Emily <Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Spicewood Springs Road Draft Proposals

Hi Ms. Tuttle!

Thank you so much for incorporating public input on the Spicewood Springs Mobility Project! I have many questions, comments, and concerns. I'll try and organize my ideas the best I can and I appreciate the welcoming of public input for this project.

Speed Limit

The one-lane design for the segment of Spicewood Springs Road under review seems to work well by functionally connecting traffic from Mesa Dr. and Loop 1 to Loop 360. However, for the 3 Alternatives and the No Build option, is there going to be any chance of increasing the speed limit to 35mph to match the rest of the corridor? It would be advantageous to raise the speed limit regardless of whichever plan is chosen for numerous reasons:

- The concentration of residential and commercial facilities is lower on the 30mph section under review which seems to be counterproductive to letting traffic move more effectively when there is less traffic turning on and off the street. A median would mean less traffic would be turning across traffic so a faster speed would be more appropriate.
- Since there is one lane of traffic on each side for Alternative A, it is critical that traffic flow be as efficient as possible because passing would not be available.
- Additionally, if a median was put in place such as in Alternative A or Alternative C, the inability for head-on collisions to readily happen would enable higher speeds such as 35mph to match the rest of the thoroughfare, or ideally, 40mph.
- Spicewood Springs Road functions as a highway access road for the entire Northwest Hills neighborhood, for Loop 360 and U.S. Route 183 (by Loop 360 Northbound). Building a road or bringing up its standards to accommodate this function would be more advantageous for the neighborhoods that the road serves.

For my neighborhood, family, and I, if the option No Build, Alternative A, or Alternative C, were chosen, an appropriate speed limit would be 35 mph. However, Alternative B's two lanes of traffic on each side closely packed against each other seems very dangerous without a median because it appears it would increase the risk of head-on collisions, similar to the segment of Ranch to Market Road 2222 from Loop 360 to Spur 69.

Alternative A Intersection with Loop 360

On the Spicewood Springs Road Draft Alternatives sheet, it depicts the intersection between Alternative A and Loop 360 with only two lanes Westbound, a left turn only lane, and a shared straight and right turn lane. The current traffic pattern with three lanes, a left turn only, a three-direction lane, and a right turn only lane is significantly more advantageous. The current pattern relieves West Spicewood Springs congestion because it allows right turn only traffic to move through the intersection while Loop 360 traffic moving North does not have to stop. This is critical because Northwest Hills neighborhood's best access to U.S. Route 183 is by going North on Loop 360. However, Eliminating a right turn lane would be unfavorable for highway access and would increase traffic congestion. If Alternative A is implemented, I would like to see that this traffic pattern at the intersection not be lost because of its value.

Shared Use Path


The draft alternatives for Alternative B and Alternative C includes a "Shared Use Path" but I am unsure as to what this would look like. Would it be a raised dual use paved bicycle lane and sidewalk? Would it be a paved bicycle lane and an unpaved at-level sidewalk? Would it be an unpaved bicycle lane and sidewalk?

Lane Width

For Alternative B and Alternative C, would the lane width be decreased? I really like Alternative C because the traffic pattern with a median and Michigan-left turn styled interludes in the median allows much more comfortable traffic flow. However, Alternative B and C would be less attractive if the lane width for these options would be diminished.

Thank you for reading through my comments and questions and I look forward to your response.

Best,



From: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [Landry, Genest](#); [Terranova, Paul](#)
Subject: RE: Feedback on Spicewood Springs Road Project
Date: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 12:07:00 PM

[REDACTED] – Conditions of the existing roadway were documented and considered alongside the vision and goals of Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, as part of our public outreach process last fall, we collected feedback from the community during a public comment period on likes/dislikes regarding the existing roadway, and incomplete bicycle and pedestrian facilities was a frequently cited concern.

We are in the middle of our public comment period for the draft alternatives, and your comments will be included as part of this process. CC'd on this email is our project manager, Genest Landry, and our program lead, Paul Terranova.

Thanks,

Emily Tuttle
Public Information Specialist, Sr.
Austin Transportation Department
512-974-6509

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2018 4:12 PM
To: Tuttle, Emily <Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Re: Feedback on Spicewood Springs Road Project

Yes I'm well aware of Imagine Austin, including how the city council ignored it in relation to the Austin Oaks project.

Unfortunately, your answer to me is the equivalent of "because we're not using any discrimination or discernment and how we apply the plan". It's the equivalent of "if it applies to one, it applies to all." It's the equivalent of "Who cares what makes sense here? We can acknowledge it was a stupid mistake later after everybody has started screaming about what a stupid and worthless waste of money it was."

Just like how citizens have been screaming that the fee in lieu of building affordable housing was a ridiculously low joke, and now, years later, the city council is saying "hey, our 'fee in lieu of' is entirely too low and we should do something about that.

Your answer is insufficient. Please advise who I need to escalate to. Or perhaps I should just cut to the chase and get in touch with Alison Alter, if this generic response is the best you've got.

On Fri, Aug 31, 2018, 3:50 PM Tuttle, Emily <Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov> wrote:

[REDACTED] – Thanks for your email. In June 2014, Austin City Council adopted a Complete Streets

Policy that helps to realize the community's [Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan](#) vision for a healthy, green, vibrant, compact and connected community. You can read the policy [here](#).

As part of the Complete Streets Policy, the ordinance requires that all new road construction and reconstruction projects will include "pedestrian and bicycle facilities."

Please let me know if you have additional questions, and thanks for sharing this feedback.

Emily Tuttle
Public Information Specialist, Sr.
Austin Transportation Department
512-974-6509

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2018 3:38 PM
To: Tuttle, Emily <Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Feedback on Spicewood Springs Road Project

Emily,

Let me start by saying that I have lived in the neighborhoods around Spicewood Springs Road since 1976. I have traveled on the section of road slated for improvements on a regular basis for all of those 42 year.

Given the incredibly steep grade of that section of road, it is unsurprising that I cannot recall ever seeing a single pedestrian or bicycle trying to climb that road.

Yeah I was fully expecting whichever bonehead consultant the city hired would suggest that bike and pedestrian lanes are needed there. It's almost as if some reusable pattern is being robotically applied, with zero regard to the road conditions the pattern is being applied to.

I expect to see an option that does NOT include pedestrian and bike paths, given the steep grade of the road. Where is that option so I can submit my comments? What do I have to do to get that most sensible of all options added to the choices?

Because the way it stands right now, not a one of the three options makes any sense for those road conditions. In fact, it is so ridiculous to propose bike and pedestrian paths for that road that it feels like those in charge of these designs have never personally driven the road and have no clue what the road is like. Yes, it is that outrageous, what is being proposed.

Please advise why we are not being given an option to avoid bike and pedestrian lanes that will cost money and narrow the road for no usable reason.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: Re: Provide feedback on three mobility and safety options for Spicewood Springs Road by Sept 14!
Date: Sunday, September 02, 2018 1:43:06 PM

Where is the 4th option, which avoids wasting money and space on bicycle and pedestrian lanes? Have you even looked at this hill? Because if anyone involved in this project had simply laid eyes on this road, there would be an understanding that no one's going to be walking up or biking up that hill. As it is, there's no option to vote for that makes sense because the idiots are running the asylum.

On Fri, Aug 31, 2018, 1:45 PM Austin Transportation Department
<Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov> wrote:

[Email not displaying correctly? View it in your browser.](#)



Review safety and mobility options for Spicewood Springs Road

Thanks to everyone who came by our Spicewood Springs Road open house Wednesday night to review information on possible safety and mobility improvements on Spicewood Springs Road!

If you couldn't make the open house or would like to review the three draft alternatives for safety and mobility improvements again, all materials and an online comment card are available on [AustinTexas.gov/SpicewoodSpringsRd](https://austintexas.gov/SpicewoodSpringsRd). Feedback on the three draft alternatives can be submitted through September 14.

This fall, staff will finalize one alternative to move into the design phase of the project, which will begin immediately.

The 2016 Mobility Bond, approved by voters in November 2016, includes funding for preliminary engineering, design and construction of improvements on Spicewood Springs Road between Loop 360 and Mesa Drive. For more information on the 2016 Mobility Bond, visit [AustinTexas.gov/2016Bond](https://austintexas.gov/2016Bond).

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: Project ID 11880.001 Spicewood Springs
Date: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 1:34:16 PM
Attachments: [REDACTED]

Hello Emily,

I attended the meeting on August 29th.

1. After studying the 3 alternative plans, I believe that alternative A or C are the best of the 3 alternatives.
2. Alternative B provides no spacing between the autos and the bicycle lanes and therefore is dangerous.
3. Alternative C should move the most traffic, I like the separation and sharing of bicycle/walking path.
4. I don't believe that you need separate bicycle and walking paths as proposed by alternative A. Also alternative A moves the least amount of traffic
5. I like the turnarounds but would like more detail as to what they would actually look like. We own the office building at 4520 Spicewood Springs Road.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

The information contained in this electronic-mail message is confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone or return electronic-mail message and delete the sent message immediately. Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: Re: Spicewood Springs Mobility Project
Date: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 11:43:53 PM

Sorry for the inconvenience but I had an additional thought.

If there were a median all the way to the intersection from the Eastern beginning of construction to the intersection with Adirondack Trail, I would like Alternative C. However with the current drafts, I really like Alternative A and No Draft because it is much safer with more spacious lanes. Also, having the middle turn lane and left turn options in No Build and Alternative A relieves current traffic pressure. I am strong against B and C in their current state.

On Wed, Sep 12, 2018 at 23:25 [REDACTED] > wrote:
Hello!

I have a comment about the Spicewood Springs Mobility Project.

I think not having a median or a middle lane would be dangerous because of the chance of head-on collisions on the somewhat winding road. Thus, I don't like Alternative B. I also do not like the section near loop 360 without a median in Alternative C.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: Spicewood Springs rd Project
Date: Thursday, September 13, 2018 12:53:05 PM

Hi Emily,

We met at the open house recently and I did not yet get a chance to submit my feedback. I checked the website and can not find a way to do so online. Please let me know if that is a preferable method. I cast my vote for option C. The alternatives just do not make much sense to me. Option B is a road hazard with what will surely be lots more accidents, it is a bad version of Burnett rd and I can not see a benefit. Option A is essentially not much different than what we have now so why expand if there will be no change. That leaves option C as the most sensible option.

One request I do have. Since the road will be busier and faster, I would like a chance to work on my signage. Who can I get in touch with at the city to discuss signage on the street?

Thank you

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: RE: Spicewood Springs Road Project
Date: Friday, September 14, 2018 11:48:44 AM

Emily:

Thank you for your explanation.

I think I get it – the traffic delays in the PM westbound will be caused by the fewer opportunities to turn left when going westbound and with shorter left turn lanes, traffic will be backed up into the main lane and since eastbound traffic from 360 will be a continuous flow (Intersection changed to a grade separated Intersection) it will make the ability to turn left just that much more difficult. That solution seems to be shortsighted as proposed; making longer turn lanes might alleviate the traffic delays going westbound. The fewer left turn lanes also force more people to make more U-turns which in turn will further delay the cars trying to make a left turn as it requires more space between cars to turn into the oncoming traffic without causing accidents or slowing things up.

Perhaps the biggest issue that I did not fully appreciate was that if the intersection at Spicewood Springs and 360 is built as a grade separated intersection (i.e. no signals) then that alone will encourage a huge volume of traffic to use Spicewood Springs Road as they will not be held up at the 360/Spicewood intersection. That mere change has the ability to turn Spicewood Springs Road into a major artery making life for those that live or work on Spicewood Springs forever worse. Is making the 360/Spicewood intersection a grade separated intersection an absolute given or is that also up for comment and review?

I understand the need for mobility, but sacrificing those who live and work on Spicewood Springs for the benefit of the thru or transit drivers seems unfair. The through drivers should use the freeways (360, 183, and Mopac) and keep heavy traffic off side streets which are for neighborhood or localized traffic.

I noted the number of crashes at various points on the project map, but it is not clear from the information presented what the causes of the crashes are and whether the introduction of a median and left turn lanes would necessarily reduce the accident rate. I am concerned that cars having to make U-turns and have to find their way into the traffic could potentially be the cause of more accidents (and delays) when the continuous flow of cars forces them to be impatient and they find the urge to ease into the traffic when it is not safe to do so. While I am not a great fan of multiple traffic lights, perhaps left turn signals (traffic Lights) which are traffic sensitive activated, might be an answer to allow cars to safely U-turn and/or perform a left turn – this may help the balance of allowing those who live and work on Spicewood Springs Road to access their properties or work with a degree of ease while not turning Spicewood Springs Road into a non-stop continuous flow of traffic and easy route for drivers who are doing nothing more than passing through.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]

From: Tuttle, Emily <Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov>

Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 10:01 AM

Subject: RE: Spicewood Springs Road Project

Good morning - Thanks for your email. The modeling we have done for the three build alternatives and the 2027 No Build also capture TxDOT's upcoming project at Loop 360.

If Loop 360 is built by TxDOT as a grade separated intersection (as planned and assumed by this modeling), the traffic flow will change. Instead of the gaps in traffic coming from Loop 360 that occur now due to the traffic signal, the new grade separated configuration will produce a consistent flow of traffic because Loop 360 will no longer be signalized. Additionally, Alternatives A and C both add medians, so the number of locations that will be available to make left turns will be reduced compared to present day conditions. The Alternative A modeling shows that this consistent flow of traffic, coupled with the reduced number of locations to make these left turns, will increase peak hour delay because the queue at the locations where people can make left turns/u turns may exceed the storage space in the left-turn bays. Since there is only one lane in each direction in Alternative A, if vehicles back up waiting for the left-turn bay space, through-traffic will be delayed.

There are, however, considerable safety benefits to Alternative A. The number of vehicle conflict points is reduced and we anticipate significant crash reductions (see the safety board) as a result of adding medians. Increasing safety and reducing congestion are both key project goals.

Please let me know if this makes sense or if you have additional questions—I'm happy to discuss on the phone if that's easier.

Thanks,
Emily

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 8:49 PM

To: Tuttle, Emily <Emily.Tuttle@austintexas.gov>

Subject: Spicewood Springs Road Project

Importance: High

Hi Emily:

I was reviewing the traffic delay chart and noticed that the No Build option seems to be significantly better than the Alternative A option. Could you Please explain why the traffic delays are worse with that option than with a No Build option.

Also the only real increase in traffic delays for the No Build Option is the PM westbound. The other three peak travel times seems to be somewhat similar to the current counts in 2017 – could you please explain why the PM westbound increases the way it does but the others are relatively stagnant.

Thank you




From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: Spicewood Springs
Date: Friday, September 14, 2018 4:32:10 PM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Emily:

As an owner of a building on Spicewood Springs, I support "option C".

Thank you

--



Advisory services offered through Per Stirling Capital Management, LLC.

Please Note: Trade instructions are not accepted by any means of electronic communication, which includes but is not limited to email, voicemail or facsimile. Please contact your financial advisor or the Per Stirling home office at (512) 628-2300 should you need assistance. Please be advised that communications regarding account value or trades in your account are for informational purposes only. You should continue to rely on confirmations and statements received from the custodian(s) of your assets.

Links to third-party web sites are provided for informational/marketing purposes only. Per Stirling does not endorse nor suppose to support the contents or opinions of third-party links. Per Stirling is not responsible for the content of a third-party website. Privacy and security policies may differ from those practiced by Per Stirling.

The text of this communication is confidential, and use by any person who is not the intended recipient is prohibited. Any person who receives this communication in error is requested to immediately destroy the text of this communication without copying or further dissemination. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Warning: All email sent to or from the Per Stirling email system is subject to archival, monitoring and/or review by Per Stirling compliance personnel. v.2017-05

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Spillar, Rob](#)
Cc: [Emily Chenevert](#); [Amy Everhart](#); [Goode, Robert](#); [Tuttle, Emily](#)
Subject: Comments on Spicewood Springs Road Improvements, 2016 Mobility Bond
Date: Friday, September 14, 2018 7:21:45 PM
Attachments: [ABoRCommentsSpicewoodSpringsRd_14Sept2018.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Hello Director Spillar, I am submitting the attached comments in response to the proposed Spicewood Springs Mobility Project alternatives on behalf of our CEO, Emily Chenevert. I also want to offer our gratitude for the Spicewood Springs team at ATD taking the time to visit our headquarters and present the alternatives to our management in person.

Please let me know if you have any questions about the attached comments, and I would be happy to set up a meeting or a call with our management to further discuss our concerns.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



MEMO

TO: Robert Spillar, Director, Austin Transportation Department
FROM: [REDACTED]
Cc: Robert Goode, Assistant City Manager
Emily Tuttle, Public Information Specialist, Austin Transportation Department
Alison Alter, Austin City Council Member, District 10

DATE: September 14, 2018

RE: Comments on Spicewood Springs Road Improvements, 2016 Mobility Bond

Dear Mr. Spillar,

After reviewing the alternatives developed by the Austin Transportation Department, the Austin Board of REALTORS® respectfully submits the below comments on behalf of our 13,000 members. ABoR offers these comments for our membership as well as our member event center, which provides much-needed events space and is regularly available free-of-charge to community partners, such as AISD, nonprofit organizations, neighborhood groups, and local governments.

ABoR has some real concerns about how the proposed alternatives A-C will impact our ability to hold essential member activities at our headquarters. With regard to the alternatives presented, Alternative C appears to be the only viable option that would increase travel capacity while affording relatively safe ingress and egress to the many sites along Spicewood Springs Rd. Alternative A does not address long-term traffic capacity needs, while Alternative B appears to pose safety concerns for both through traffic and vehicles attempting to merge onto Spicewood Springs from local residences and businesses.

The Alternative C layout, however, is problematic in that it does not provide for a left-hand turn out of either of ABoR's parking lot access points. Under Alternative C, vehicles leaving our headquarters and traveling east on Spicewood must merge into the left lane heading west and then make a U-turn in order to reverse directions and access Mesa Dr., Far West Blvd., and Anderson Ln.

ABoR is concerned about the need for vehicles to make U-turns as an alternative to a left turn on several grounds:

- vehicles attempting to make U-turns could be at greater risk of collision from continuous oncoming traffic traveling east from Hwy 360;

- with increased traffic volume and more steady traffic flow stemming from Hwy 360, vehicles attempting to make a U-turn might have to wait a long time;
- demand to travel east will likely be high enough during peak hours to cause backups in the median turnouts from vehicles waiting to make a U-turn; and
- this could cause standing traffic in the left westbound lane and create dangerous speed differentials for traffic heading in that direction.

The mobility and safety concerns posed by these alternatives are strong sources of concern for ABoR's leadership and management.

As you may know, ABoR spent over \$310,000 just three years ago as part of a cost-sharing agreement with the City to construct a new turn lane that improves safety both for ABoR members and surrounding residences and businesses. We spent these funds without hesitation with guidance from the City this would be an important safety improvement for Spicewood Springs. It is therefore concerning to us that many of the alternatives, including Alternative C, eliminate this turn lane and, along with it, the access and safety advantages that prompted its construction.

ABoR has enjoyed a strong partnership with the City in developing a headquarters site that is reflective of community goals – achieving a high level of LEED certification, adding a row of mature, native oak trees along Spicewood Springs, building sidewalks, and adding a public-access park. We hope to address our concerns in the context of this partnership and identify an improved road configuration that will work for the thousands of members and others who rely on safe access to ABoR's HQ each year.

While we do not believe the current proposals are workable for us, we are eager to partner with the City toward an outcome that improves safety and access for all who rely on Spicewood Springs Rd.