



Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
1	6/27/2019	Open House	Would like to see immediate attention paid to traffic at RBT and Stratford, which is already problematic. This project will only <u>add</u> to that current problem. I already cannot turn left from Stratford to RB most times of day. I think a resolution of this issue should be part of this project, not wait until it's done.	<p><u>Westlake Drive Intersection</u> The City is aware of traffic flow problems along Redbud Trail from Stratford Drive to Westlake Drive. The Westlake Drive intersection is out of our jurisdiction and must be primarily solved by West Lake Hills. Austin Transportation has been encouraging West Lake Hills to jointly work on a solution there.</p> <p><u>Stratford Drive Intersection</u> Unfortunately, an intersection and/or signalization study for Redbud Trail at Stratford Drive is not part of this work. Austin Transportation has tried some smaller fixes to the intersection with Stratford over time, the additional turn lane on Stratford for one and then the caution lights with the potential to become a signalized intersection. The difficulty is that the whole stretch needs to</p>
2	6/27/2019	Open House	Consider making the primary travel lane through the Redbud/Lake Austin Boulevard intersection align Redbud with Lake Austin Blvd. 1. Recognizes primary traffic flow. 2. Discourages "cut-through" traffic on Enfield Dr.	There are ongoing traffic studies currently focused on the Redbud Trail intersection at Lake Austin Blvd. Austin Transportation is investigating intersection improvements to reduce congestion and improve traffic flow. If it is possible, and a feasible solution can be developed and funded in time, it is our hope that some intersection work at Lake Austin Blvd could be included in this project.
3	6/27/2019	Open House	1. Make no changes. 2. Use funds for IH35	<p><u>Improvements to IH-35</u> TxDOT is responsible for the interstate highway system. They are already in the midst of executing over 90 "mini" projects over the next 10 years to improve IH-35 through the Austin area. The City's bridge project will improve public safety by addressing problems such as: the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues along the approach roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p>
4	6/27/2019	Open House	I go to Redbud Isle with my dogs every day. My concern is about the additional impact on the infrastructure of adding additional parking spaces. There are already over 800 dogs a day at Redbud, and as much as I love dogs, the habitat cannot support doubling that or more by adding parking. Please do a study of what the park can actually support. *I am the park adopter for Redbud Isle.	<p><u>Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> More parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however, the City's Parks and Recreation Department is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This would more safely accommodate where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e., the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed, returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.</p>
5	6/27/2019	Open House	Well Done! Very positive: lower elevation, subdued lighting, fix S curve, extra length on lanes up to Lake Austin Blvd., limited to 2-car lanes; traffic open during construction; fix bridge before it fails. Question: Additional parking at Redbud Isle will triple parking spots (21 currently, 60+ in plan). Have you had a park expert determine maximum use to avoid overuse? Is 60+ the right number, or 40 or 30?	<p><u>Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> More parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however, the City's Parks and Recreation Department is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This would more safely accommodate where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e., the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed, returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.</p>
6a	6/27/2019	Open House	Best Development: Intersection Redbud @ Lake Austin Blvd.! This hadn't been included before. Attached is drawing I made, which is very similar to proposed design. One lane in each direction on bridge is adequate. The problem is not having a dedicated right turn lane at Lake Austin Blvd., so thank you for including it. Consider only lighting in handrails and low bollards.	<p>Comments noted - thank you.</p> <p><u>Lighting</u> Roadway and pedestrian path safety lighting is planned; light fixtures will be configured to reduce light spillage and avoid light pollution.</p>

Rebuda Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
6b	6/27/2019	Open House	I have thoughts re: roadway cross-section (see attached dwg [on separate page in spreadsheet]). Considered locating utility zone in center of bridge to provide a median (for safety) and allow space for westbound left turn lane into dog park. Another option is to eliminate shoulders and only have the center section over utilities to serve as emergency parking, left turn lane to park, and safety median. Plus it's cheaper!	<u>Geometric Concerns</u> The shoulder widths are in compliance with TxDOT preferences and are appropriate to allow for driver refuge/breakdown, emergency vehicle access, and driver passing around left-turning or stranded vehicles. The shoulder also provides a place for trucks to access the utility corridor and not hinder roadway traffic.
7	6/27/2019	Open House	Please consider lowering pedestrian and utility corridors as much as possible (from intersection at Redbud Isle to edge of lake). Much better for bikers and peds sound-wise, and much better aesthetics for all.	<u>Depressing the Pedestrian Path</u> The City would like to keep the bicycle and pedestrian paths out of the 100-year flood along with elevation established for the vehicular traffic. It is also more cost efficient to utilize the roadway deck elevation.
8	6/27/2019	Open House	The project preferred alternative was supposed to have been selected with safety in mind, but it is designed for increased rather than decreased speeds. Alternative #5 would have improved safety by designing for a decreased speed. Additionally, the increase in shoulder width while not decreasing the travel lane width would adversely impact safety. The proposed changes to Pleasant Valley limit roadway width to less than 11 feet, so the same should be done here.	<u>Design Speed/Safety</u> Design speed, posted speed, average driver speed, and speed enforcement are all slightly different. Here, the design speed selected, and associated geometry, is appropriate for the level of traffic that the roadway serves and its classification as an arterial roadway. The lane and shoulder widths are in compliance with TxDOT preferences and AASHTO national best practices and have been vetted with the Austin Transportation Department. Widths are appropriate to allow for truck traffic to Ullrich WTP, emergency vehicle access, and driver safety. The speed selected is also consistent with driver expectations on an arterial street. A 25 MPH design speed would only be appropriate for a situation where a higher, safe speed cannot physically be achieved. Regardless of design speed, after construction, the posted speed limit may be at or less than the roadway design speed. This along with speed enforcement are typical operational concerns.
9	6/27/2019	Open House	The proposed alternative is better than I expected. Overall pleased. While I'd prefer the tighter turning radius of Alt 5 because of the lower environmental impact, I understand the safety issues involved. Going forward, my biggest concern is now the drainage issues, along (Buzzard Hollow?) on the east side of Redbud Trail/the bridge near the curve. The engineering team didn't even know how much water goes through there. A lot of those gullies in the area can have flows much higher than expected due to the Karst geology and the intermittent springs. Monitor that, especially during a high rain event. Overall, pretty good - love the direct access to the park.	<u>Preliminary Design Phase</u> We are not yet at the detailed design phase where such finer points will be fully addressed. However, the team is aware of Buzzard Hollow and existing drainage issues. The future roadway and bridge design will take the anticipated stormwater conditions for this area into account.
10	6/27/2019	Open House	Preferred alternative looking pretty good. I wonder if the width could be reduced to reduce the overall bridge footprint. Do we need 2 shoulders (of 8' each)?	<u>Shoulder Widths</u> The lane and shoulder widths are in compliance with TxDOT preferences and AASHTO national best practices; have been vetted with the Austin Transportation Department; and are appropriate to allow for truck traffic, emergency vehicle access, and driver safety. Problems can occur on either or both sides and travel directions. A single shoulder or narrow shoulders creates an unavoidable hazard and traffic disruption if adequate space is not available on either side where it is needed along the bridge.
11	6/27/2019	Open House	Preferred alternative looks great.	Comment noted - thank you.
12a	6/27/2019	Open House	Could you provide a topographic overlay of the configuration of bridge and roadway on the west/south end? I am concerned with the grotto. Currently, there is a very steep dropoff with unreinforced fill and your road is going further west into the void. The grotto/cliff top is unstable and dropped/failed this past winter (on west side of south/west endpoint).	<u>Preliminary Design Phase</u> Please note that we are still in the preliminary design phase and not yet performing detailed design where such finer points will be fully addressed. During the design phase, a more detailed topographic survey will be developed than is currently available. The bridge and roadway designs will take drop offs, slope stability, and environmental features into consideration.

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
12b	6/27/2019	Open House	I am worried about traffic control at the park entrance. With reconfigured road, speed will increase! Increased parking does not seem desirable. Park is at near capacity. You could add 1000 spaces and you'd then have 1,001 folks trying to access.	<u>Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> More parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however, the City's Parks and Recreation Department is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This would more safely accommodate where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e., the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed, returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.
13	6/27/2019	Open House	Please limit additional parking. The island can get crowded and the vegetation may not be able to support more activity. Make sure emergency vehicles can access. Considering using "Tow Away Zone" signs to enforce parking.	<u>Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> More parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however, the City's Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This would more safely accommodate where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e., the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.
14	6/27/2019	Open House	Please do not severely restrict traffic during Austin City Limits and Trail of Lights. The bridge is our only way out to central and north Austin.	<u>Maintenance of Traffic</u> Maintenance of traffic is a key consideration in the project sequencing and construction. The existing bridge will remain open to traffic during construction. In fact, almost the entire existing bridge will remain in service throughout the new bridge construction. And although there will have to be at least a few short-term disruptions to normal two-way traffic flow, our goal will be to minimize these disruptions to the degree possible.
15	6/27/2019	Open House	Redbud Isle Park won't support 60 parking spaces - not if it is going to remain a dog park. 25 spaces max. We're losing Huts and Celis - keep this one tiny part of Austin liveable.	<u>Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> More parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however, the City's Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This essentially more safely accommodates where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e. the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.
16	6/27/2019	Open House	What is the capacity of Redbud Isle? The island cannot thrive with so many additional parking spaces. Currently, about 800 dogs visit on good weather days (less when really cold) and the island will deteriorate with significantly more. Instead, please have the City open more off-leash parks (fenced and of reasonable size) other places in the City. The park feels very crowded when all parking spaces are full and dog aggression, poop and too many humans. Also, please provide a boat ramp somewhere else. The boaters use parking for many hours at a time - the dog walkers come and go in 30 min or an hour.	<u>Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> More parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however, the City's Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This essentially more safely accommodates where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e. the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
17a	6/30/2019	Email	<p>My impression is that you have done a fine job of design on the project and have considered a wide range of factors that the project will impact, if and when it is realized. However, I have a number of issues with the current plan and I would like to discuss them below.</p> <p>My overall impression of this specific plan is that it is a very expensive solution in search of a problem. To be sure, there are a number of problems with the current transportation solution that conveys Redbud Trail traffic across the Colorado River between Austin and Westlake Hills/Rollingwood. However, the solution that you have proposed seems to address a number of relatively “minor” issues while leaving the primary problem-horribly restricted rush hour traffic flow- completely unaddressed.</p> <p>Let’s take a look at what I rank as the most pressing problems that a credible Public Works project should address in this area.</p>	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. The project will improve public safety by addressing the fact that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p> <p><u>Traffic Flow</u> All of the transportation solutions are secondary to the primary project. It is purely a practical matter to improve the approach roadways and consider any nearby transportation improvements that might be affected within the project limits.</p>
17b	6/30/2019	Email	<p>TRAFFIC FLOW</p> <p>The current low water bridge was constructed when the population of Westlake Hills and Rollingwood were a fraction of what they are today. The destination of most of the traffic over the bridge at this time was very limited; Loop 360 didn’t exist; Westlake Drive didn’t connect to any north or westbound traffic routes and there was no such thing as “rush hour” traffic congestion. Fast forward 70 years and the traffic capacity of the low water bridge and Redbud Trail have not significantly changed but the volume of traffic is dramatically greater, particularly at both morning and evening rush hour. Both the bridge and Redbud Trail carry only two lanes of traffic, one in each direction, and there are limited and inadequate turn lanes to Stratford and Forest Trail. And there is no turn lane whatsoever for westbound traffic into Redbud Isle.</p> <p>A superficial analysis might suggest that this traffic is the problem of Westlake Hills and Rollingwood, both incorporated cities and not part of the City of Austin. However, this explanation would mis-understand the situation.</p> <p>Redbud Trail and the low water bridge have become the “choke points” for “cut through” traffic patterns that connect the northern and western parts of the City of Austin and Western Travis County to Central Austin. The bulk of the traffic using Redbud trail during rush hours does NOT originate or terminate in Westlake Hills or Rollingwood.</p> <p>Instead, it is largely made up of vehicles TRANSITING through those cities from one part of Austin to another. So, in fact, this is an Austin generated traffic problem and requires a City of Austin</p>	<p><u>Traffic Flow</u> Traffic flow has little to do with the rationale for this bridge project. The reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Traffic flow may be addressed by some potential ancillary work. However, all of the transportation solutions are secondary to the primary project. It is purely a practical matter to improve the approach roadways and consider any nearby transportation improvements that might be affected within the project limits.</p>
17c	6/30/2019	Email	<p>This fact is further supported by the locations of the bottlenecks on Redbud Trail and Westlake Drive. At every evening rush hour, the “inbound” Westlake Drive and Redbud trail intersection is grid-locked with traffic from 360 “cutting through” WLH on Westlake Drive to Redbud Trail, traffic “cutting through” WLH on Redbud Trail from Bee Caves Road and traffic “cutting through” WLH on northbound Westlake Drive from Bee Caves Road. On many occasions, traffic on Westlake Drive is backed up for a half mile or more from the Redbud Trail intersection in BOTH directions because so few cars can flow down Redbud trail to the bridge due to lack of capacity in the ONE travel lane.</p> <p>A similar situation occurs for traffic leaving Central Austin at evening rush hour. Vehicles are often backed up for a half mile or more on Lake Austin Boulevard in both directions on either side of the Redbud Trail intersection. This is outbound traffic using Redbud Trail to “cut through” Westlake Hills to get to Bee Caves Road and Loop 360. The vast majority of this traffic does NOT terminate in Rollingwood or Westlake Hills; it is City of Austin traffic over burdening Red Bud Trail and the bridge to “cut through” to other parts of the City of Austin.</p>	<p>Responses provided below for answers to summary traffic flow questions.</p>

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
 CIP Project No. 5873.012
 Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
17d	6/30/2019	Email	<p>TRAFFIC FLOW SOLUTION</p> <p>In my opinion, the first and most critical issue that Public Works should address is accommodating this enormous increase in traffic generated by City of Austin residents. I believe the solutions are straightforward and achievable and should cost less than \$50,000,000.</p> <p>1.Widen the existing bridge, with reinforcement, to four lanes, two in each direction. A three-lane solution with a reversible lane will not work because the evening rush hour traffic flow are already excessive in both directions. The current bridge is 29 feet wide and the addition of two twelve-foot lanes would expand it to 53 feet. Utilities can be placed below the roadway, especially if it is slightly raised, and there would still be room for a protected bicycle and pedestrian lane within the proposed new 72-foot width.</p> <p>2.Widen Redbud Trail to four lanes from Lake Austin Boulevard to Westlake Drive, adding adequate turn lanes at Redbud Isle, Stratford and Forest Trail.</p> <p>3.Request financial participation from Westlake Hills and Rollingwood for the portions of the project that adjoin those cities.</p> <p>At the public meeting, we asked a number of the staff members present about why this solution was not considered. Their replies indicated that the project was focused on access to Redbud Isle, with a special emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The impression that was left with us was that PW staff did not consider the heavy traffic flows to be a part of their problem because that traffic was ostensibly heading out of Austin and was therefore “not Austin’s problem”. I believe I have refuted that argument above.</p> <p>In addition, a number of the PW staff members present admitted that they were completely unaware of the traffic issues on Redbud past Redbud Isle and some had not ever paid that area a visit!</p>	<p>Responses provided below for answers to summary traffic flow questions.</p>

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
17e	6/30/2019	Email	<p>OTHER DESIGN RATIONALES</p> <p>At the Open House, we also questioned a number of other aspects of the design: <i>Why is it necessary to elevate the new bridge so much? The current bridge has been in place for almost 75 years and has never been under water, even when water flowed over the Tom Miller Dam spillway.....</i></p> <p>We were told that the current bridge lies in a “100-year floodplain” and that was why the new bridge had to be so elevated, adding enormously to its cost. We commented that we had driven across the low water bridge in 1981 without incident, during the epic flood that happened that year. The answer we got was that the 1981 flood, one of the worst in contemporary Austin history, was not the 100-year flood that was being designed for. The <u>particular</u> 100 year flood that was used to justify elevating the bridge to such a degree was a <u>hypothetical</u> 100 year flood that MIGHT occur far up river in the Colorado drainage basin, hypothetically causing ALL of the gates at Mansfield Dam to be opened simultaneously and requiring ALL of the gates at Tom Miller dam to be opened as well. This level of flow MIGHT cause water to exceed the height of the roadway of the current bridge and so the design needed to protect against that extremely theoretical event.</p> <p>When we asked whether this particular 100-year flood had ever occurred in recorded history, we were told it had not.</p> <p>We were also told that the bridge needed to be elevated to protect the utility lines (water and wastewater) that cross the river under the bridge. We pointed out that there are many other, more cost-effective solutions for protecting pipes in far harsher conditions than those occasionally found at this point on the Colorado River, including encasing the lines in a reinforced concrete vault structure and/or burying them in the riverbed.</p> <p>We also pointed out that there are other instances on the Colorado River where unprotected water and waste water lines cross the river underwater without incident. Staff had no good reply to this information.</p> <p>It seems that spending millions of dollars to elevate a bridge and roadway to avoid a very specific and highly theoretical weather event that has never occurred to date is not the best use of taxpayer money, not to mention the negative aesthetic impact of a much taller bridge structure.</p> <p>A simpler and far most cost effective solution would be to keep the bridge at its current height and, <u>in the unlikely event that the hypothetical “perfect storm” occurs, putting water over the bridge.</u></p>	<p><u>Project Rationale</u></p> <p>The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. We are raising the bridge out of the Town Lake Watershed floodplain to comply with current drainage regulations and best practices for hydraulic bridge design. The elevations being used are from LCRA and COA Watershed Protection based on river analysis, dam system release estimates, and relevant flood data. The final elevation will be driven by the most appropriate solution satisfying the design constraints in the best manner possible. The height profile of the proposed bridge is shown on the project website. The relative height change varies, but it is now set as reasonably low as it can be. The proposed bridge is taller than the existing bridge since it will be built above the 100-year water surface elevation.</p>
17f	6/30/2019	Email	<p>We asked about the large amount of bridge and roadway width that was being dedicated to pedestrian and bicycle traffic and were told by staff that the current bridge was unsafe due to the narrow sidewalks and lack of shoulders.</p> <p>In response, we pointed out that encouraging bicycle traffic to cross the bridge and proceed west on Redbud Trail was EXTREMELY irresponsible on the part of the City of Austin due to the complete</p>	<p><u>Rationale for Bike Lanes and Sidewalks</u></p> <p>The argument cuts both ways. You made the point that there've been "a number of serious injuries" over the years where there are no bike lanes, sidewalks, shoulders and bar ditches next to the roadway. So, if we continue to choose never to provide safe accessible routes, there will continue to be serious injuries.</p>
17g	6/30/2019	Email	<p>So, in summation, I would ask the following questions:</p> <p>1. Did you seriously consider widening the bridge and Redbud Trail to four lanes and why was this solution rejected? Were public meetings held where this solution was offered? If so, what was the documented response?</p>	<p><u>Traffic Growth</u></p> <p>Through four-lane traffic is limited by the capacity of Westlake Drive (West Lake Hills) to the west. The current concept plan increases lanes and widens the roadway east of the bridge as it approaches the Lake Austin Blvd. intersection; reducing congestion at this intersection will reduce the related roadway congestion. Any comments received by the public regarding a four-lane solution have been documented, responded to, and posted on the project website.</p>
17h	6/30/2019	Email	<p>2. Were traffic studies done on this section of road during the design phase of the project? What was the outcome of those studies and can we see copies?</p>	<p><u>Traffic Study</u></p> <p>There are ongoing traffic studies currently focused on the Redbud Trail intersection at Lake Austin Blvd. Austin Transportation is investigating intersection improvements to reduce congestion and improve traffic flow. If it is possible, and a feasible solution can be developed and funded in time, it is our hope that some intersection work at Lake Austin Blvd could be included in this project.</p>
17i	6/30/2019	Email	<p>3. Were studies done to predict the demand from pedestrians and bicycles for transit across the bridge? What daily demand of each was predicted and used as the basis of design? Can we see copies of those studies?</p>	<p><u>Active Transportation</u></p> <p>Pedestrian/bicycle demand studies are limited; the current bridge has essentially no space for safe bicycle or pedestrian travel. The City's intent is to provide safe access to the park for various travel modes.</p>

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
17j	6/30/2019	Email	4.Can you defend the current design from a cost-benefit standpoint, and can we see that analysis?	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p> <p><u>Cost-Benefit Ratio</u> A preliminary assessment has provided a positive benefit-cost ratio; this will be evaluated further as the project progresses, but is not ready for public distribution.</p> <p><u>Availability of Reports</u> It is Public Works policy not to share partially completed engineering products. Incomplete work products are not fully developed, validated, nor ready for general release by the consulting firm and professional engineer. They are also potentially subject to extensive change and thus may be misleading or confusing if released prematurely. Completed interim products will be made public throughout the various stages of project development.</p>
18a	7/13/2019	Email	After attending the Redbud Trail Bridge Project Public Open House on June 27th, 2019, Board members of the West Austin Neighborhood Group considered the proposed plans for replacement of the Emmett Shelton Bridge. Please review the following questions and comments from some of our Board Members: 1. We would like to see the results of the Environmental Study or Analysis of the entire area affected by the bridge replacement. Has one been done?	<p><u>Environmental Assessment</u> To date we have completed a preliminary environmental existing conditions assessment, and vetted this with City staff as necessary for the evaluation of conceptual alternative bridge and roadway corridors. A detailed environmental impacts analysis and report as a result of the proposed bridge replacement will be completed and submitted for permitting and review purposes during the subsequent design phases of the project. This report will inform the project team and reviewing agencies about concerns, requirements, mitigation, and restoration.</p>
18b	7/13/2019	Email	2. We would like to review traffic studies done for the Lake Austin Blvd. and Red Bud Trail intersection. Was a traffic count done to obtain the number "16,000 vehicles a day" using the bridge?	<p><u>Traffic Study</u> The 16,600 vehicles per day estimate was obtained from TXDOT Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) values at the bridge location. This is physically collected over a 24 hour or longer period by a pneumatic tube traffic counting device.</p>
18c	7/13/2019	Email	3. Has Watershed Protection been involved in order to evaluate the impact of construction of the proposed bridge, and demolition of the older bridge, on this environmentally sensitive area?	<p><u>Environmental Concerns</u> The Public Works Department has been and will continue to closely coordinate with the City's Watershed Protection Dept. and other City departments to evaluate the impact of this project.</p>
18d	7/13/2019	Email	4. The Town Lake Comprehensive Plan designated the area near the dam "The West Preserve" referring to the rugged, natural landscape, and wildlife habitat. Several of the smaller islands west of the current bridge are nesting grounds for swans and other wildlife that inhabits the lake. The proposed 71' wide bridge will ENTIRELY COVER these areas. They will be disrupted if not destroyed by the support columns needed for the new bridge.	<p><u>Environmental Assessment</u> The detailed environmental analysis in the next phase of the project will allow us to further determine habitat and environmental resources in more detail. The proposed bridge will span a small percentage of land north of Redbud Isle. The City intends to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental impacts. The exact locations of bridge piers and columns have some flexibility to allow for avoiding special sites. Note that "bridging over" a site, while reducing direct sunlight, does not preclude maintaining a natural state of most of the land underneath the bridge.</p>
18e	7/13/2019	Email	5. How much of the natural growth will need to be cleared to build the proposed bridge? We are opposed to tearing out the natural landscape and cutting down trees in this area.	<p><u>Preliminary Design Phase</u> The new bridge has not yet been designed and is in the concept stage, but the corridor comparison and project intent continues to be to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental impacts. The construction site will be restored and possibly even improved with guidance from Watershed Protection and Parks and Recreation.</p>
18f	7/13/2019	Email	6. Some of our Board members feel that the bridge is unnecessarily wide, going from 28' to 71'. We would like to suggest that the lanes be 10' wide and the shoulders 5'.	<p><u>Alternative Transportation</u> The conceptual design of the bridge allows for vehicles as well as bicyclists and pedestrians (on a</p>

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
18g	7/13/2019	Email	7. Regarding additional parking places for Red Bud Island: We are opposed to sacrificing the natural environment for more parking and a bigger wider bridge.	<u>Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> More parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however the City's Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This essentially more safely accommodates where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e. the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.
18h	7/13/2019	Email	8. The Neighborhood is interested in Red Bud Isle, and wants to be sure that users of the parkland as well as persons from PARD are included in discussions about the proposed new bridge, and how it relates to Red Bud Isle.	<u>PARD Representation/Meeting Notification</u> Parks and Recreation representatives are stakeholders on this project and have been included in many discussions about the bridge. The Public Works Department advertised both public meetings held thus far in the newspaper, on social media, on the City's website, and with an on-side electronic messaging sign.
18i	7/13/2019	Email	9. Can you please provide a diagram showing height changes of the bridge in increments (every 10 feet.) Your diagram appears to have the new bridge twice as tall as the old bridge. We would like to meet with you to discuss these issues further, at your earliest convenience.	<u>Bridge Elevation</u> The bridge elevation is not a free choice within a large range of heights. The final elevation will be driven by the most appropriate solution satisfying the design constraints in the best manner possible. The height profile of the proposed bridge is shown on the project website. The relative height change varies, but it is now set as reasonably low as it can be. The proposed bridge is taller than the existing bridge since it will be built above the 100-year water surface elevation.
19a	7/22/2019	Survey	While informative to an extent, many questions to the different parties involved in this project could not be answered since details are still being worked out or that question is not within their responsibility parameters. Even with only two vehicular traffic lanes, the number of vehicles using the bridge will continue to increase as the population in the area grows. Additionally, bike and pedestrian traffic will increase because of easier access. This will create potential problems for future use.	<u>Traffic Growth</u> The project intends to maintain a two lane bridge with safety shoulders. This configuration is expected to serve the needs for the foreseeable future. Development on the Lake Austin Blvd (east) side of the bridge is an unknown. However, Westlake Drive will always be a limiting factor for significant increases in traffic on the bridge coming from the east. And, while modest growth over time will occur and a little more development west of the bridge is likely, the westerly areas served by this structure are significantly developed. No great influx of new bridge users is anticipated nor even feasible without a huge transformation of the character and capacity over the entire length of Westlake Drive. The chances of this magnitude of development occurring throughout West Lake Hills is exceptionally remote.
19b	7/22/2019	Survey	We are concerned about environmental impact. What agency will have responsibility for ensuring the sensitive nature of this area will be protected?	<u>Environmental Impact</u> The project team will coordinate with applicable federal and state agencies, as well as the City of Austin for all environmental permits and approvals. Some agencies include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, and the City's Watershed Protection and Parks and Recreation. The City departments are partners in the development, design, review, and inspection of this project.
19c	7/22/2019	Survey	What agency will be responsible for maintaining the grounds on Red Bud Isle?	<u>Maintenance of Redbud Isle</u> Yes, the City's Parks and Recreation Department manages and already maintains the Redbud Isle park.

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
19d	7/22/2019	Survey	Why is so much money being spent on alternative transportation lanes when the infrastructure within the City of Austin is in the worst condition and is worsening with each passing day. Where are the priorities on implementing necessary and needed repairs?	<p><u>Infrastructure Condition</u> It is regrettable that you feel that Austin is in terrible condition. We do need to continually improve; however, ratings of Austin's infrastructure actually compare quite favorably against the other comparable large cities to which we benchmark ourselves.</p> <p><u>Alternative Transportation</u> Alternative transportation lanes have been a mandate for quite a while now. Active transportation like walking, running, and biking has been a high priority for Austin for decades.</p> <p><u>Safety Improvements</u> The project is improving public safety by addressing problems such as: the bridge is beyond its structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p>
19e	7/22/2019	Survey	Finally, as citizens in West Lake Hills, we do not support any measures that will increase traffic into our city.	<p><u>Safety/Traffic Congestion</u> The project will increase safety without adding lanes to the bridge and intends to reduce congestion at the Redbud Trail intersection at Lake Austin Blvd.</p>
20		Survey	Bad idea. People should take Mopac and public transportation. Going to destruct eco life drive up pollution. Focus on areas of greater need than how rich people get to downtown.	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p>
21		Survey	My God, really! Why are we putting a superhighway to nowhere - and destroying the natural beauty of the area while we are at it. All I have heard from Westlake is that no one there wants it - so it is just going to go down to one lane each way there anyway - all we are doing is spending \$54M to make a 2 lane parking lot during rush hour. WE have heard from the Mayor that because of property tax breaks, we are going to be so short of money and will have to cut fire and police - why are we wasting this level of money on a dead end project?? How about just widening the existing bridge a bit for safety reasons and adding a higher up smaller metal suspension bridge for bikers and pedestrians? This would make so much more sense at this location. PLEASE RECONSIDER!	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p>
22		Survey	The bridge should be built wide enough so that it could be converted to two lanes of traffic in each direction someday. There is no reason to build a new bridge if the maximum capacity is the exact same as the current bridge. Many people will oppose the bridge on NIMBY principles or because it will force approximately five birds to find a new place to nest. I am 24 years old and have lived in Austin since I was born. I live in Tarrytown now. When I am 50 years old I hope that Red Bud Trail will be two lanes in each direction. Please do not waste this opportunity to plan for the future of Austin, which is projected to double in population by 2040. Please spend the public bond money to make the future of Austin a less congested future.	<p><u>Traffic Growth/Number of Lanes</u> The project intends to maintain a two lane bridge, with safety shoulders. This configuration is expected to serve the needs for the foreseeable future. While development on the Lake Austin Blvd (east) side of the bridge is an unknown, Westlake Drive will always be a limiting factor for significant increases in traffic on the bridge coming from the east. And, while modest growth over time will occur and a little more development west of the bridge is likely, the westerly areas served by this structure are significantly developed. No great influx of new bridge users is anticipated nor even feasible without a huge transformation of the character and capacity over the entire length of Westlake Drive. The chances of this magnitude of development occurring throughout West Lake Hills is exceptionally remote.</p>
23a		Survey	Regarding the current proposed "favored" bridge option as of June 2019: 1. The width of the bridge seems to have expanded. See Austin American-Statesman July 2018. Does impervious coverage apply to bridges? Will there be new plants and improvements to the area to compensate for the extra concrete?	<p><u>Impervious Cover</u> The bridge and roadway will work within the City's rules related to impervious cover; it is anticipated that improvements will be incorporated into the design to address the increase in impervious cover. Also note that most of the currently pervious cover below the bridge will remain similarly unpaved with the only consequence being less direct sunlight.</p>
23b		Survey	2. The cost of the bridge seems to be considerably more than other similar bridges that have been built in the center Texas region. Why is this? See next door app comparisons in the June 20 replies re: the bridge open house announcement-Made by A Westlake Citizen	<p><u>Bridge Bid Prices</u> A tremendous number of factors affect bridge prices. Some key factors are structure type, bridge length, and deck width. Additional factors are environmental and drainage constraints, site conditions and constraints on construction, aesthetic elements, construction sequence and maintenance of traffic, and approach roadway geometry. Realistic bridge prices cannot be applied simplistically without consideration of all of these factors. No truly similar bridges have been built in this area recently since the somewhat similar Pfluger Pedestrian Bridge.</p>

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
23c		Survey	3. Given one end of the bridge is going to be considerably wider than the other doesn't this logically imply that there will be a huge bottleneck on one side? It would be helpful to understand why it is so large on the Side where there is no park but instead just Lake Austin Boulevard. It makes one wonder what other things are requiring the additional space on Lake Austin Boulevard.	<u>Bridge Width is Constant</u> The bridge width stays constant throughout the project as do the two vehicular travel lanes. However, the approach roadway (street) might be a slightly different width at the west end due to bike lanes and the new curves leading away from the bridge.
23d		Survey	4. Since the city has lost its lease to UT in May 2019 Of the golf course, does this proposed version take into consideration future additional developments/population increase? Sharing what the COA demographer forecasts if There is no known developments in progress would be helpful to understand the traffic patterns.	<u>Traffic Growth</u> The project intends to maintain a two lane bridge, with safety shoulders. This configuration is expected to serve the needs for the foreseeable future. While development on the Lake Austin Blvd (east) side of the bridge is an unknown, Westlake Drive will always be a limiting factor for significant increases in traffic on the bridge coming from the east. And, while modest growth over time will occur and a little more development west of the bridge is likely, the westerly areas served by this structure are significantly developed. No great influx of new bridge users is anticipated nor even feasible without a huge transformation of the character and capacity over the entire length of Westlake Drive. The chances of this magnitude of development occurring throughout West Lake Hills is exceptionally remote.
23e		Survey	5. The July 8 Austin American-Statesman article focuses on the benefit of pedestrians & their use of the bridge. What is the projected amount of usage given this additional space? - []	<u>Use of Additional Deck Width</u> The cross section shows the spacings and purpose for each "lane" designated. The new use areas include the new roadway lanes on the bridge, roadway shoulders (2x 8' = 16'), a shared use path (12'), a utility corridor (14'), and various divider barriers (5' total). That comes to a total of 45 additional feet of deck width more than the existing deck's 28 feet.
23f		Survey	6. It is not clear if passengers Will be able to look over the bridge at Red bud isle and the water.	<u>View/Visibility</u> Yes, automobile drivers and passengers will be able to look at Redbud Isle and the water. Railing designs will be carefully considered for aesthetics and visibility for both the view from the bridge and looking at the bridge.
23g		Survey	7. Currently there are no lights on the bridge but it is proposed for the new bridge. This impact of this decision was not explicit despite concerns from the first meeting regarding light pollution.	<u>Bridge Lighting</u> Yes, some modest street and sidewalk lighting is advisable in an otherwise dark area. It will require a balance of safety and environment as do all decisions in the urban environment. Roadway and pedestrian path safety lighting is planned; light fixtures will be configured to reduce light spillage and avoid light pollution.
23h		Survey	Regarding the process of your meeting: 1. Having only one hour to review the information prior to the open house was less than ideal. It is hard to have good questions when you don't understand what you're being asked to give feedback about. In addition to the little time for review, The slides were not scalable and very difficult to read.	<u>Availability of Open House Materials</u> It is standard procedure to upload pubic meeting materials on the day of the meetng. We intended for it to be clear that additional comments would still be encouraged after the open house. The official comment period was held open three weeks after the materials were initially made available and comments may still be submitted, although they will not be part of the official public meeting documentation.
23i		Survey	2. A Visual showing the decision making process was missing from the slide deck.	This missing visual has been added to the project website.
23j		Survey	3. A study Was listed on the slide as if one had been conducted. It was disappointing to find out that no research study had been done. A historical document review and database reviews Do not constitute a true study but instead an analysis of other studies. This type of misinformation can create ill will and decrease trust.	<u>Environmental Concerns</u> To date we have completed a preliminary environmental existing conditions assessment, and vetted this with City staff as necessary for the evaluation of conceptual alternative bridge and roadway corridors. A detailed environmental impacts analysis and report as a result of the proposed bridge replacement will be completed and submitted for permitting and review purposes during the subsequent design phases of the project. This report will inform the project team and reviewing agencies about concerns, requirements, mitigation, and restoration.
23k		Survey	4. Why is notification only on the public works website and not put it on the city of Austin website? A tiny little ad in the Austin American-Statesman 3 days in advance is also Not proper notice. Perhaps in the future you could put a sign on the bridge to inform bridge users that Their feedback is truly wanted.	<u>Public Involvement</u> Each City department advertises its own events, including public meetings. The meeting was also advertised extensively on social media and in an on-site electronic messaging sign, in addition to the website and newspaper notifications.

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
23l		Survey	5. Most all decision making processes I've ever seen spend a great deal of time diagnosing the situation Prior to a decision being made. Do I understand this process correctly that the Location of the bridge is going to be decided first and then a studies of the impact of that location Will be conducted? While I appreciate The complexities of a coordinated effort between the city and the consultants ...not to mention the quick timeline, however, Wouldn't this possibly cause delays and problems than should studies indicate negative impact on the area, the citizens, the land owners, the neighborhood associations, the wildlife, etc.?	<u>Complex Design Process</u> The design of a large bridge like this is a very complex and at times iterative process. The preliminary engineering is being carefully and deliberately executed to ensure that an appropriate solution will be developed in the final design phase. Initial environmental surveys allowed for a preliminary assessment of existing environmental conditions and was vetted with City staff to evaluate conceptual alternative bridges and roadway corridors. This was part of the overall corridor evaluation decision process and had to be thorough enough to weigh the alternatives. A detailed environmental impacts analysis and report will be completed during the subsequent design phase of the project based on the specific bridge replacement proposal that is finally selected. This report will inform the project team and reviewing agencies about concerns, requirements, mitigation, and restoration.
24a		Survey	I do not understand the logic of replacing the existing bridge with one that is much larger with no real benefits to be derived from the high financial cost involved. Having attended you latest open house, here are my takeaways: Cost vs benefit. I am not convinced that your premise for building a new bridge, i.e. the possibility of a catastrophic flood event happening in the next 100 years, is necessarily correct, especially given the amount of tax payer money earmarked for this project? I would like to see a detailed risk analysis that would review: Prior flood history: What has happened in the area in the last 200 years. Has there ever been a devastating flood in that area? Actual historic flood damage incurred: If there has, how much real damage has occurred? Repair costs: If so, how much did it cost to restore the bridge to full operations? Real risk assessment. Only by conducting such a detailed analysis, will you be able to see whether spending the envisioned \$50 million on a new replacement bridge is really the best risk mitigation solution for this roadway. You may find, for instance, that there has never been a devastating flood that has serious damaged the existing structure. Or that the cost of repairs to the structure following a flood were minimal in comparison to the high costs to taxpayers of completely replacing the existing bridge. Once such a real risk assessment, based on actual prior events and ensuing damages, has been completed, then you can better estimate what the next steps should be. If it were found that the area has suffered several devastating floods that have wiped out the bridge and caused significant damage, personal injury or even loss of life, then you should consider what is the most efficient use of tax payer monies to mitigate the risk of such happening in the future. Current bridge designs questionable. But even the bridge designs so far proposed seem to go way beyond what is good and efficient use of taxpayer funds.	<u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge. <u>Rehabilitation Options</u> The current bridge was already extensively rehabilitated in 1998 to extend its useful life as far as possible. Further structural modifications would not be very cost effective or reasonable. <u>Bridge Elevation</u> We are raising the bridge out of the Town Lake Watershed floodplain to comply with current drainage regulations and best practices for hydraulic bridge design. The elevations being used are from LCRA and COA Watershed Protection based on river analysis, dam system release estimates, and relevant flood data. The final elevation will be driven by the most appropriate solution satisfying the design constraints in the best manner possible. The height profile of the proposed bridge is shown on the project website. The relative height change varies, but it is now set as reasonably low as it can be. The proposed bridge is taller than the existing bridge since it will be built above the 100-year water surface elevation.
24b		Survey	(1) The need for wide additional lanes to accommodate foot and bicycle traffic does not seem to make a lot of sense. The bridge roadway will feed into the existing two-lane road leading to Westlake Drive and beyond. This is all very hilly terrain and not the type that is ever frequented by either pedestrians or bicyclists. (2) It also defies reason that we would need such a wide thoroughfare to accommodate foot and bicycle traffic to visit Redbud Isle Park, which has a very small footprint. As such a wide extra lane for this type of traffic does not seem necessary.	<u>Shared Use Path</u> The Redbud Isle park area is already a popular destination but can only be arrived at safely by car. However, the area is hampered by poor alternative access for walking, running, or biking. Furthermore, this is the far end of the Lance Armstrong Bikeway and the improvements will allow for additional safe biking routes and options. The conceptual design of the bridge allows for vehicles as well as bicyclists and pedestrians on a shared use path. It is standard practice to design new bridges in this fashion to accommodate vehicles as well as pedestrians and bicyclists. The width of the shared use path is in accordance with design guidance.
24c		Survey	(3) Why are such wide shoulders needed? There are no such shoulders on the roadways immediately before or after the bridge so it is hard to understand why having such wide shoulders on the bridge itself would serve any useful purpose.	<u>Deck Width/Safety</u> The roadways on either side have additional width for safe passage. The lane and shoulder widths are in compliance with TxDOT preferences and AASHTO national best practices; have been vetted with the Austin Transportation Department; and are appropriate to allow for truck traffic, emergency vehicle access, and driver safety.
24d		Survey	(4) A separate lane to house utility lines seems excessive. It might be easier and cheaper to protect the existing lines, or to build a protective housing for these lines to prevent damage from floods.	The utilities are designed within a separate utility corridor to allow Austin Water to <u>safely</u> perform routine maintenance activities on the water and wastewater utilities with minimal impacts to vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
24e		Survey	Still the overarching questions are: (1) Do we really need a new bridge at all? and (2) Why could we not overhaul the existing structure, or, if needed, build a new one on the same footprint? Once after a proper risk assessment has been completed can we possible answers these. In sum, I think we need to make the most efficient use of tax payer funds to solve real problems and manage real risks and not embark on Pharonic projects if other more cost effective solutions are possible.	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p> <p><u>Rehabilitation Options</u> The current bridge was already extensively rehabilitated in 1998 to extend its useful life as far as possible. Further structural modifications would not be very cost effective or reasonable.</p>
25a		Survey	I am distressed about the plans for the bridge. It is too wide. How many cyclists and walkers will actually use it?	<p><u>Deck Width</u> The cross section shows the spacings and purpose for each "lane" designated. The new use areas include the new roadway lanes on the bridge, roadway shoulders (2x 8'= 16'), a shared use path (12'), a utility corridor (14'), and various divider barriers (5' total). That comes to a total of 45 additional feet of deck width more than the existing deck's 28 feet.</p> <p><u>Alternative Transportation Users</u> The Redbud Isle park area is already a popular destination but can only be arrived at safely by car. However, the area is hampered by poor alternative access for walking, running, or biking. Furthermore, this is the far end of the Lance Armstrong Bikeway and will allow for additional safe biking routes and options. The conceptual design of the bridge allows for vehicles as well as bicyclists and pedestrians on a shared use path. It is standard practice to design new bridges in this fashion to accommodate vehicles as well as pedestrians and bicyclists. The width of the shared use path is in accordance with design guidance.</p>
25b		Survey	Why wasn't an environmental study done? What spend such a huge amount on a project that won't alleviate traffic and will ruin the rural character of the are around the current bridge.	<p><u>Environmental Concerns</u> To date we have completed a preliminary environmental existing conditions assessment, and vetted this with City staff as necessary for the evaluation of conceptual alternative bridge and roadway corridors. A detailed environmental impacts analysis and report as a result of the proposed bridge replacement will be completed during the subsequent design phase of the project.</p> <p><u>Safety Improvements</u> The project is improving public safety by addressing problems such as: the bridge is at the end of its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the approach roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p>
25c		Survey	More than 500 people signed the petition asking for further modifications. To me, a useless boondoggle but the City does what it wants regardless of public opinion. Why not a hearing where people can formally express their views?	<p><u>Open House Format</u> The City commonly uses the public open house format because it allows participants to review project information and interact directly with the project team. Written comments have as much weight as spoken ones.</p>
26a		Survey	The project should first and foremost respect and retain the natural environment that contains the existing bridge, especially as that area is presented in the Town Lake Park Comprehensive Plan and Ordinance, and in the Brackenridge Development Agreement. Because of that natural environment, the current planned bridge is unnecessarily wide and taller than it need be - and most likely would be less expensive to construct were it not as large and imposing - thus detracting from the importance of the bluffs, trees, wildlife, etc.	<p><u>Balance of Environment & Project Requirements</u> The project will improve public safety while also being considerate of the environment. The bridge is at the end of its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge. The lane and shoulder widths are in compliance with TxDOT preferences and AASHTO national best practices; have been vetted with the Austin Transportation Department; and are appropriate to allow for truck traffic , emergency vehicle access, and driver safety. The elevation of the proposed bridge follows design standards related to current bridge and drainage regulations and is driven by dam operations and analysis of potential flooding along the Colorado River.</p>

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
26b		Survey	Also, where are the traffic studies re the current traffic? How can a new bridge best fit in with the other bridges across Lady Bird Lake, and with the guidelines of the Town Lake Park Comprehensive Plan?	<p><u>Traffic Volumes</u> The 16,600 vehicles per day estimate was obtained from TXDOT Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) values at the bridge location. This is physically collected over a 24 hour or longer period by an actual pneumatic tube traffic counting device.</p> <p><u>Fit With Other Bridges</u> The new bridge will fit in with the other bridges across Lady Bird Lake by being able to continue to serve its intended purpose for another 100 years.</p> <p><u>Traffic Studies</u> There are ongoing traffic studies currently focused on the Redbud Trail intersection at Lake Austin Blvd. Austin Transportation is investigating intersection improvements to reduce congestion and improve traffic flow. If it is possible and a feasible solution can be developed and funded in time, it is our hope that some intersection work at Lake Austin Blvd could be included in this project.</p> <p><u>Town Lake Park Comprehensive Plan</u> All known applicable and relevant plans, studies, and agreements will be considered in the design process.</p>
26c		Survey	What is the speed limit now on the bridge, and on Redbud Trail from the bridge up to the intersection with Westlake Drive? Why would you want a 35 mile speed limit on the bridge? A slower speed would allow drivers and passengers a better opportunity to take in the natural surroundings of the area, and be more relaxed and less stressed.	<p><u>Safety</u> Design speed, posted speed, average driver speed, and speed enforcement are all slightly different. Here, the design speed selected and associated geometry is appropriate for the level of traffic that the roadway serves and its classification as an arterial roadway. The lane and shoulder widths are in compliance with TxDOT preferences and AASHTO national best practices; have been vetted with the Austin Transportation Department. Widths are appropriate to allow for truck traffic to Ullrich WTP, emergency vehicle access, and driver safety. The speed selected is also consistent with driver expectations on an arterial street. A 25 MPH design speed would only be appropriate for a situation where a higher, safe speed cannot physically be achieved. Regardless of design speed, after construction, the posted speed limit may be at or less than the roadway design speed. This along with speed enforcement are typical operational concerns.</p>
26d		Survey	Why wasn't a representative from the Parks Department at the June gathering? And someone from the Austin Water Utility/Ullrich Water Treatment Plant?	<p><u>PARD & AW Representation</u> Representatives from both the Parks and Recreation Department and Austin Water were present at the meeting in addition to Public Works, Austin Transportation, and our engineering consultant.</p>
26e		Survey	The bridge project is just one project that will impact the West Austin Neighborhood Group area - (and West Lake Hills, etc.) - but we are also aware of traffic studies that have been done and/or are being done along Lake Austin Blvd, Enfield, and Exposition by UT, the City of Austin and HEB. The bridge project should make sure that those other studies are coordinated with any considerations re changes/improvements to the intersection of Redbud Trail and Lake Austin Blvd. As you may know, I have been involved with these issues - including , in the 1980's, Ullrich Water Treatment Plant and their use of the Emmett Shelton Bridge - since the 1970's. More effort should be made by Public Works to assure a continuing dialogue between citizens and those working on the project.	<p><u>Intersection Studies</u> There are ongoing traffic studies currently focused on the Redbud Trail intersection at Lake Austin Blvd. Austin Transportation is investigating intersection improvements to reduce congestion and improve traffic flow. If it is possible, and a feasible solution can be developed and funded in time, it is our hope that some intersection work at Lake Austin Blvd could be included in this project.</p> <p><u>Coordination of Studies & Plans</u> All known applicable and relevant plans, studies, and agreements will be considered in the design process.</p>
27a		Survey	Several issues with the replacement bridge: The bridge is way too wide! Such a colossal bridge will mar the beauty and ecology of this environmentally sensitive sliver of Austin. Instead of putting the pedestrian and bicycle lanes alongside the proposed new bridge, why not keep the old bridge as a ped/bike route only with access to Redbud Isle. When there is a risk of flooding, close off the old road. No one should be going to Redbud Isle when conditions are dangerous in any case. In the time that I've lived in Austin, since 1954, there has never been a flood that breached the bridge. \$50 million is a huge amount to spend on a bridge that mostly serves Ulrich trucks and cut-through traffic. Why the exorbitant amount? And why the extra-wide shoulders that can easily be turned into extra lanes. West Lake does not want, nor can accommodate, any more traffic!	<p><u>Deck Width</u> The cross section shows the spacings and purpose for each "lane" designated. The new use areas include the new roadway lanes on the bridge, roadway shoulders (2x 8'= 16'), a shared use path (12'), a utility corridor (14'), and various divider barriers (5' total). That comes to a total of 45 additional feet of deck width more than the existing deck's 28 feet.</p> <p><u>Safety Motivation</u> The project's purpose is to improve public safety, while also being protective of the environment. The bridge is beyond its structural life and has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge. The lane and shoulder widths are in compliance with TxDOT preferences; have been vetted with the Austin Transportation Department; and are appropriate to allow for truck traffic , emergency vehicle access, and driver safety. The elevation of the proposed bridge follows design standards related to bridge safety.</p>

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
27b		Survey	As for safety, the beautiful S curve that engineers have deemed so dangerous: according to the Texas Department of Transportation crash reports, Redbud Trail within City limits (which includes the S curve) has been the site of 172 vehicular accidents in the 2010 - 2018 period (0 fatalities). Redbud has actually seen the number of accidents drop on average from 2013 to 2018 by 9.1%. Surely there are more critically dangerous roadways where taxpayer monies would be better spent? If people refuse to safely follow the speed limit, why not put in speed bumps? City and state engineers seem to be on a wrong-headed mission in the name of "safety" to eliminate all curves and low-water crossings in Austin and make it exactly like Dallas and Houston with massive concrete bridges, highways and flyovers—and ruin all the things that people come here for in the	<u>Maintaining the Natural Character</u> The roadway west of the bridge was listed in the 2016 City of Austin bond election as among the top priorities for crash reduction and roadway safety. Roadway safety improvements are being sensibly included with the new bridge. We are not removing the curves. However, we do strongly believe that a slightly more gently curved roadway through the bluffs will be every bit as attractive as the existing roadway. Fortunately, it will also be far safer for complying with nationally accepted transportation engineering practices.
27c		Survey	The public has yet to see environmental analyses, nor have there been any open public hearings for discussion, only two open houses for people to view designs that they had no input into. Surely you can do better and come up with a less obtrusive option!	<u>Environmental Concerns</u> To date we have completed a preliminary environmental existing conditions assessment, and vetted this with City staff as necessary for the evaluation of conceptual alternative bridge and roadway corridors. A detailed environmental impacts analysis and report as a result of the proposed bridge replacement will be completed and submitted for permitting and review purposes during the subsequent design phases of the project. This report will inform the project team and reviewing agencies about concerns, requirements, mitigation, and restoration.
28a		Survey	I'm very glad to see that the shared use path would be on the park access side of the roadway - however, are so many new parking spaces really needed for Red Bud Isle? With the new shared use path, wouldn't there be less of a need for parking?	<u>Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> More parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however the City's Parks and Recreation Department (PARC) is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This essentially more safely accommodates where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e. the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.
28b		Survey	I support a new, safer bridge - but the bridge should prioritize pedestrian and bicyclist safety - have Vision Zero principles in mind. Make it hard for drivers to speed.	<u>Safety</u> The shared use path is intended to provide pedestrian and bicycle safety.
28c		Survey	Shade structures over the shared use path would be great too, to protect from the hot sun. Make the shade structures fun and colorful!	Comment noted. Thank you.
29		Survey	Changing the current bridge configuration will be a traffic and environmental disaster - not to mention the much better places to spend \$54M - please reconsider. Very few people actually want this.	<u>Safety</u> The project is improving public safety by addressing problems such as: the bridge is beyond its structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge. <u>Maintenance of Traffic</u> Maintenance of traffic is a key consideration in the project sequencing and construction. The existing bridge will remain open to traffic during construction. In fact, almost the entire existing bridge will remain in service throughout the new bridge construction. And although there will have to be at least a few short-term disruptions to normal two-way traffic flow, our goal will be to minimize these disruptions to the degree possible. <u>Environmental Concerns</u> The project will be designed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse environmental impacts. The construction site will be restored and possibly even improved with guidance from Watershed Protection and Parks and Recreation.

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
30		Survey	Please just repair the bridge. The new plan is an eye-sore and will only draw more unwanted traffic. The added traffic won't have a place to go in Westlake. Don't ruin it!	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p> <p><u>Rehabilitation Options</u> The current bridge was already extensively rehabilitated in 1998 to extend its useful life as far as possible. Further structural modifications would not be very cost effective or reasonable.</p>
31		Survey	Trying to see the concept drawings, but keep getting re-directed to this survey! Very frustrating.	Comment noted. Thank you.
32a		Survey	How long will it take and cost? Will it open up the west side to more traffic on the dangerous roads?	<p><u>Cost and Safety</u> The City has budgeted approximately \$50M; construction will take roughly 2 years to complete. The project's purpose is to increase bridge safety, not add bridge lanes. We also intend to improve roadway safety in the approach areas to this critical crossing.</p>
32b		Survey	I do not want more dog features!!! No more dog friendly areas! The homeless are already making that area dangerous.	<p><u>Dog Features/Parking Spaces at Redbud Isle</u> We are not modifying the park land or park amenities themselves. However, more parking is needed on Redbud Isle park to accommodate the large number of people using the park. The final layout (and number of spaces) has not yet been set; however the City's Parks and Recreation Department (PARC) is in favor of improving the park with additional parking. We propose to include some additional parking for the park positioned on areas of the existing Redbud Trail roadway that will be abandoned. This essentially more safely accommodates where people already double park or overflow into the right of way on the existing roadway shoulders at busy times. In general, new parking spaces will be placed in areas that were previously paved (i.e. the existing Redbud Trail). In addition, some of the existing Redbud Trail and pavement adjacent to the park will be removed returning that land as vegetated, pervious cover to the Park. This work will contribute favorably to our parks mitigation.</p>
33		Survey	Please just refurbish the existing bridge. That area as it exists is a special place aesthetically with enormous character.	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p> <p><u>Rehabilitation Options</u> The current bridge was already extensively rehabilitated in 1998 to extend its useful life as far as possible. Further structural modifications would not be very cost effective or reasonable.</p> <p><u>Environmental Concerns</u> The project will be designed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse environmental impacts. The construction site will be restored and possibly even improved with guidance from Watershed Protection and Parks and Recreation.</p>
34		Survey	Terrible idea. Leave what is there as a pedestrian bridge. Such waste of money. Typical Austin. Tried to ram a similar bridge and road idea through in about 1975 so that West lake folks could have an easier drive into town. Now, it's back.	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p>
35		Survey	I love the design, especially the shared use path. As a cyclist and jogger, I don't feel safe on the current bridge. The new path will be great. Also, I'm excited about the additional parking at Red	Comment Noted - thank you.
36		Survey	I was not aware of the meeting or I would have attended.	<p><u>Notification of Open House</u> The public open house was advertised in the Austn American-Statesman, on the City's website, on social media, and in an on-site electronic messaging sign.</p>

Redbud Trail Bridge Selection/Concept Design Phase
CIP Project No. 5873.012
Public Comments/Responses from June 27, 2019 Open House

Comment	Date	Venue	Comments	Comment Response
37		Survey	No new bridge	<p><u>Project Rationale</u> The primary reason we are replacing this bridge is that it has reached the end of its useful structural life. Thus, the project will improve public safety by addressing that the bridge is beyond its useful structural life; the bridge has inadequate safety measures for autos, bikes, and pedestrians; and there are safety issues for the roadways adjacent to the bridge.</p> <p><u>Rehabilitation Options</u> The current bridge was already extensively rehabilitated in 1998 to extend its useful life as far as possible. Further structural modifications would not be very cost effective or reasonable.</p>
38		Survey	seems to be a long-overdue upgrade	Comment Noted - thank you.
39		Survey	Thanks. This looks like a progressive plan that includes safer bike and pedestrian access. Build it higher than you think you need to to meet the new Atlas14 data and likelihood of greater flooding.	Comment Noted - thank you.
40a		Survey	In reviewing the public meeting materials, please accept the following feedback: - The proposed bridge and lane widths and shoulders are excessively wide and encourage unsafe vehicular travel speed. Per current ITE standards, for travel of 45 mph or less on any non-highway roads, lane widths of 10' - 11' maximum are standard. Commit to a safer design speed of 30 MPH to reduce crashes, fatalities and sever injuries; and utilize 10' wide lanes with reduced shoulder width to 4' each. In the rare instance that a vehicle is stalled on the side, this will provide adequate room for a car to park on the side and still allow adjacent two-way flow of vehicular travel. The bridge width should be further reduced per the above to minimize the loss of riparian cover and vegetation. This is valuable habitat for wildlife and local biodiversity. Great care should be taken minimize disruption to these habitats and reducing the width will achieve this as well as reduce costs.	<p><u>Design Speed/Lane Width/Safety</u> Design speed, posted speed, average driver speed, and speed enforcement are all slightly different. Here, the design speed selected and associated geometry are appropriate for the level of traffic that the roadway serves and its classification as an arterial roadway. The lane and shoulder widths are in compliance with TxDOT preferences and AASHTO national best practices and have been vetted with the Austin Transportation Department. Widths are appropriate to allow for truck traffic to Ullrich WTP, emergency vehicle access, and driver safety. The speed selected is also consistent with driver expectations on an arterial street. A 25 MPH design speed would only be appropriate for a situation where a higher, safe speed cannot physically be achieved. Regardless of design speed, after construction, the posted speed limit may be at or less than the roadway design speed. This along with speed enforcement are a matter of systems operation.</p> <p><u>Deck Width/Shoulders</u> Problems can occur on either or both sides and travel directions. A single shoulder or narrow shoulders creates an unavoidable hazard and traffic disruption if adequate space is not available on either side where it's needed along the bridge. A 4' shoulder and minimized lane widths may not even be adequate for a stopped car which typically needs a 6-foot width; however, it is clearly is not wide enough for a stopped 8.5' wide truck or bus.</p>
40b			Any Westlake users of this bridge should be tolled for its use since they refuse to contribute to City of Austin projects that benefit them. Mechanisms that recoup some of the cost of the project from those that will use it are urged and supported.	<p><u>Potential Participation of West Lake Hills</u> This bridge is one of the few river crossings in Austin allowing access to destinations south of the river. The Origin/Destination Study we had done shows that West Lake Hills is a 25% user of the bridge; however, about 75% of the traffic on the bridge is pass through traffic. While clearly residents there do use the bridge, most of the traffic is simply passing through West Lake Hills. A fair distribution of recouping the costs would be extremely problematic as there is no practical way to collect funds from the pass through users that make up the bulk of the bridge traffic. Furthermore, the bridge and the river are entirely within the City of Austin limits. There is no agreement for forcing another agency to pay for a project that is not actually within their jurisdiction. There is also no known section within the Texas Transportation Code of State Law allowing the City to do this.</p> <p><u>Proportionality of Economy and Use</u> West Lake Hills has 3,400 residents and Austin has 951,000 residents - what would be a theoretically fair proportion of cost with such a small population base? Although the West Lake Hills residents are generating a notable proportion--25% or 4,300--of the 16,600 vehicles per day using the bridge, there are a lot of other users outside the City that would not be fairly taxed for their share.</p>
41		Survey	My comments are quite lengthy. I will e-mail them to the project staff.	Comment noted - Thank you.