

## Mobility Committee Meeting Transcript – 12/02/2015

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 12/2/2015 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 12/2/2015

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[3:07:55 PM]

>> Kitchen: Good afternoon. We're going to call to order the meeting of the mobility committee at 3:07. So the first order of business is approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion? Councilmember Zimmerman moves that we approve the minutes, second from councilmember Garza. All in favor? Minutes are passed. The next item is citizen communication. The first is Mike levy and then Hayden walker after him. >> I'm the public safety commission representative on the vision zero task force. The concern that I have is a turf and silo problem that seems to be outweighing the fact that we're talking about human lives. We see and certainly I see a problem with transportation limiting what they are -- is going to be in the report unless it's -- because it's not in their turf, it's not in their range of responsibility. >> Kitchen: You are talking about the vision zero report. >> Yeah, we're doing a report. >> Kitchen: Gotcha. >> An example is red light cameras. Apd has been very emphatic about red light cameras. We have been told not to put it in the report. I would ask that members of the council suggest to the manager to suggest to transportation they understand that turfs and silos may be the rule of the day because of city government, but it's not appropriate when we're dealing with human lives. The second thing I drove a

[3:09:58 PM]

taxi when I was in college. I drive -- I take a taxi from my office downtown, I park my car downtown and office -- take a taxi to the airport and back. I talk to these guys. Usually third world countries, immigrants, k-u-t, which is interesting, and they may wait three hours on the parking lot at Bergstrom waiting for a ride and they can be short rides. I overtip because I drove a taxi. If I give them an extra 10 or 15 dollars she it's like I gave them the goose that laid golden eggs. They have to work maybe five days out of seven just to pay the rent on their meters. The so-called Uber light operations skim the cream. And this is about human conditions. That's it, thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Mr. Walker -- or Ms. Walker. I've done that several times. I apologize. >> It's not a problem at all. It happens all the time. I'm Hayden walker with [indiscernible]. I wanted to say a couple things. One is we left copies of this colored map. We just think it's an easy way to understand how the some mopac and 45 connect to I-35 and understand how it's segmented. The other thing I wanted to mention was it's my understanding that there's discussion of park and rides on south mopac, but there are no plans to do that in the current planning effort and the current environmental. And I'm concerned about that because it seems like a north mopac we missed that opportunity. Those toll lanes are being

[3:11:59 PM]

constructed, but there are no park and rides being constructed to help serve the neighborhoods further out that might want to use buses and those toll lanes and I think it's a shame to think that might happen on south mopac as well. I don't know what can be done, but it seems like it would be really nice to be able to add park and rides and a transit plan to go with those park and rides into the south mopac project. Right now the environmental review and have that be included so it's part of the environmental so it's done and those projects can move forward. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Committee a briefing item on the south mopac later this the meeting and we can ask about park and rides. I know there's been some discussion, but I'm not sure exactly where that is? The process, and what I'm hearing you suggest is that it actually be part of the process so people can understand. >> It does seem like it would be more likely to have them built if it were actually part of the project. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Okay. Our next agenda item is the calendar for next year. So if you all will take a look at the calendar, it's in your backup, and basically it has us meeting every month except for July, and I had a question about whether we need to meet on January 20th because we're meeting on February 3rd. And I think -- councilmember Garza, you may have had a question about the August meeting. So I guess I would like to propose that -- we were going to check and assuming that the staff doesn't have anything that we've got to do on the January 20th, I was going to propose since we have the meeting on February 3rd that we just wait until then. Is that acceptable to you guys? Councilmember Garza, did you want to say something about

[3:14:02 PM]

August? >> Garza: Yeah, I just want to as we finish our rookie year, that would have been nice if we didn't have to attend committee meetings during that time so I was wondering if we could take the August one off the calendar. We could always add it in if something comes up. >> Kitchen: I'm okay with that if you are. What we can do is take it off and as we get closer to that time we'll know whether there's something and we can always do a special called meeting in there if we need one. >> Garza: I was going to say maybe reserve the spot but just not have an official -- so if we do need a meeting we know that -- you know, we can have it as an fyo -- FYI on our calendar. >> Kitchen: That makes sense. Any other changes? >> Garza: I move we adopt it taking the January and August dates out. >> Zimmerman: I second that. >> Kitchen: A motion by councilmember Garza, seconded by councilmember Zimmerman that we approve the proposed committee schedule with the two additions of taking off January 20th and taking off August 10th with the understanding we'll keep the time slot for August 10th in case we need it. Is that accurate? >> Garza: Yeah, and I just got a text from my staff, which is fine. Maybe we wait till Sheri gets here. >> Kitchen: She should be here shortly. We'll come back to that. So -- okay, so we'll move on to the first item which is item number 4, discussion and possible action on the expansion of the parking benefit district in yes, sir campus. >> Good afternoon, councilmembers, I'm Steve grassfield in charge of the parking operations for the

[3:16:03 PM]

city and I'm coming to the committee this afternoon to bring forth a proposed expansion of the west campus parking benefit district. And this was presented to the city of Austin. This is a -- the parking benefit district is a program that is done by the neighborhoods and brought to the city. So I'm coming forth today with their recommendation. The first slide up here that you'll see is actually Rio grande, and you are looking south from about 23rd street. And I just had this initially so you can see with the parking benefit district, and I'll go into some of the ordinances, the neighborhoods get some of the money back after city expenses and it's spent on transportation initiatives. And you can see in this case wider sidewalks with trees and benches and lighting and also bike lanes. To date the university area partners

has received about \$300,000 from the parking and it's gone -- obviously took more than 300,000 to build all this, but this helped in getting this moving forward. I'll take -- I'm going to take you back a little bit to give you a little bit of background on this whole thing. The west campus parking benefit district actually started as a pilot program back in 2006. It was on San Antonio from 19th to 26th, about 100 spaces. It was very successful. Council then in October 2011 approved an ordinance for parking benefit districts as a

[3:18:04 PM]

permanent program. And then the university partners actually came forth in September about a year later, 2012, and asked that we establish a parking benefit district in there. That particular district was west of Rio grande -- I'm sorry, west of Guadalupe to Rio grande and then from mlk up to 29th street. They have now come back to us and asked that we expand that parking benefit district to increase parking availability in the west campus area. To give you a little more background on the ordinance, as I mentioned previously, this is requested by the neighborhood. The city does not institute this. This is the neighborhood initiative. And basically this is to provide turnover and improve the availability of on-street parking for the businesses and visitors to the area. So the boundaries that they -- and I've got a map on the next slide that you'll see. They are looking at going west of Rio grande to Lamar and then mlk to 29th street. This will add additional 315 paid parking spaces. We -- we're putting in a time zone of five hours and Monday through Saturday. And as you are probably aware, most parking is three hours, but the students and U.T. Specifically asked for five-hour meters because of lab classes and just the distance to go to the university and back. The central Austin neighborhood planning advisory committee, which is kind of over this overriding area, they support the expansion and

[3:20:09 PM]

there's an area and I'll show out the map that has decided not to be part of this expansion. You'll see a little -- I'm a little color blind, it's a dull yellow, you can see the original parking benefit district in the brighter yellow is where the expansion is going to be. Those circles with Numbers in them, that's the number of parking spaces on each block face. But there's an area -- there's an area of -- on the west end that's mlk up to 24th and San Gabrielle west to Lamar. That's both Ip you're wana, original west university neighborhood association and the castle heights neighborhood association, they did not want the paid parking in that area. If you'll kind of notice, good reason behind that. A lot of it is residential parking permits in that area so there are very few really parking spaces in that particular area. Any questions on the map? Before I move on? >> Zimmerman: I had a question. First question is this looks like councilmember -- mayor pro tem tovo's backyard. Has she kind of chimed in on this that we know of? >> Yes. >> Zimmerman: And? >> And positively. We had an ordinance requires us to go to the urban transportation commission. >> Uh-huh. >> So we did that about a month ago, and they approved this going forward. >> Kitchen: Have you had any opposition to this? >> Not that I'm aware of. Let me introduce Mike McComb, vice president of the university area partners,

[3:22:10 PM]

who is right here. He could -- to my knowledge, Mike -- >> I would be happy to speak. >> Come on up and -- she asked about opposition to this. >> I am Mike McComb. I've been down at this building and the building before that and the building before that so I've been involved with this area for quite a long time. The parking benefit district plan is designed to create safe pedestrian sidewalks. In front of those properties that are not going to be redeveloped under the university neighborhood overlay. If you see

this map behind you or in front of you, I guess, it is basically it follows the university neighborhood overlay outlines. And so it's designed to create safe streets. The only -- there were a couple of offers from both shoal crest and iwana, which have overlapping boundaries in that area to the area that's along 22nd street and 24th street south of -- all the way to mlk, that they wanted to be involved initially. After the public hearing, it was overwhelmingly rejected that there be any meters west of San Gabrielle on the west side of San Gabrielle so we have withdrawn that area from the parking benefit district. As Steve has said, there are primary rpps in that area. Rpp is limited to single-family residential and duplex uses so there are some areas that have apartments and those areas will remain just open parking. In the north part there's a shoal crest neighborhood association and they wanted some meters as well. The parking benefit district ordinance requires there be a minimum of at least 96 spaces. Neither of these two areas have that kind of space so they are art of piggybacking.

[3:24:13 PM]

University area partners includes all of the area and these are certainly little subneighborhoods that have their own special interest because they are more residential than the university overlay area. We've met with everyone. We have agreement. To councilmember Zimmerman's question, I believe councilmember tovo will be speaking to a situation of want to go make sure that we are adequately looking at the bicycle transportation in the area. I am a bicycle rider so I have spoken with the bicycle people. They come to our neighborhood associations quite often, and we've worked with -- as the first slide showed, we have worked with the expansion of the parking -- of the bicycle lane. The bicycle lane you voted last council meeting, I believe, or maybe the one before, to let the contract to stand the cip or the bike lane and rebuild Rio grande north to 29th and that's going to be taking place and additionally we've worked with the public works department in installing a bike lane on 24th all the way to mlk that's a separated. So we work real closely with trying to get everybody safely to the campus and that includes both day and night. Thank you for letting me speak a long time. >> Kitchen: That's all right. Thank you very much. Okay. >> Okay. Just to continue, some of the ordinance requirements, you'll see the requirements to the left and what was submitted. Part of the ordinance requirements is the city must verify parking needs to support the claim. We did a parking study after this was submitted and it showed occupancy of 100 plus. You might ask a question why 100% plus. People parking in no parking Zones all day, near fire hydrants, too close to

[3:26:13 PM]

basically the cross streets, that type of thing. Typically 75 to 85% occupancy, that's kind of the industry standard. They recommend you put in paid parking for turnover. You've seen the map on the boundaries. You've met Mike, also Kathy Norman, who wasn't able to make it today, is the president of that neighborhood association. We're also required by ordinance to put out fliers, which were done on all the cars. Also yard signs announcing the different meetings. The first meeting was held on September 30th. That was the community meeting. Mike has kind of talked about that. The expansion was approved at that meeting. Then 7,000 postcards were sent out announcing the meeting which was back on November 10th. Also this meeting. And then you will see it's going to be on council agenda December 10th. As I mention -- excuse me -- the you are pan transportation commission approved this on November 10th, which is, again, required by ordinance. So basically we're, you know, obviously presenting it to you all here today to answer any questions. It will be on the council agenda. The neighborhood has asked us if possible to be able to put this expansion in paid parking in the holiday period, the student holiday period, which makes it obviously easier for us as a city to install paid parking and the signage and it makes it easier to move around the west campus area. So it's kind of our next

step. So with that, are there any additional questions? >> Kitchen: Does anyone have

[3:28:14 PM]

any questions? We are posted for discussion and possible action so if we choose we can vote to move it forward to council. It is already on the council agenda so it depends on whether or not people would like to take any action on it. Councilmember Gallo. >> Gallo: I just have a financial impact question. It doesn't look like from the committee action sheet in a was prepared that there is any fiscal impact. >> There is not. >> Gallo: But I do have a question, it does sound like there was some expense involved in the notification process to all the stakeholders. >> Yes. >> Gallo: Is that part -- I notice in the background it talks about the revenue from the paid parking after the expenses. Okay. Thank you. The revenue from the paid parking after the expenses will be split. Does the costs included after the money is split? >> Those costs have already been taken out. What we do on a monthly basis, we the city provide them with the amount of revenue, the city expenses and then their portion of it. >> Gallo: Okay. So the notification things you talked about, which was great and I appreciate you making the effort to make sure it was broadly notified, so that would be taken out of the expenses before it's split. Okay. Rob, you could answer the question. >> There's one other item, with regards to fiscal impact, rob spiller, director of transportation. What we typically do is when we add new areas, we add them in one year and then don't account for the new revenues until the next year so that we -- because the startup period is often a sort of variable period and what the revenues are. This will give us four, five,

[3:30:14 PM]

six months to approve the revenue and account for it in the next year. It doesn't go anywhere, we just don't account for it until we start budgeting. >> Gallo: Okay. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Any other questions? Yes, councilmember Garza. >> Garza: Just so I understand, you said that all the neighborhood associations were on board and any that weren't you readjusted the lines to address their concerns. >> Correct. >> Garza: Okay. >> Kitchen: Okay. Other questions? Would you all like to vote on this or should we just -- >> Gallo: I think we should move it forward with the vote. It's certainly a reasonable request to try to get the work done while the students are gone rather than dodge students. >> I think since urban transportation committee voted on it, I think it would be a good idea if you all did. >> Kitchen: Do I have a motion? Go ahead. >> Garza: I'll move to move this to council with staff's recommendation. >> Kitchen: Okay, we have a motion from councilmember Garza, a second from councilmember Gallo to move this forward to the council on December 10th with the recommendation to approve with the staff recommendation. >> Zimmerman: I would like to speak in favor. I'm going to be voting for this because I have not received any opposition to it and it's also in mayor pro tem's downtown district and she's in favor, I think we should be voting in favor of it. >> Kitchen: All in favor? The vote is 4-0. Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay, next we'll go back to our council committee schedule and what we've got on the table is we have a motion before us to approve the schedule with two changes. To take off the meeting on January 20th, the thinking there being that since we have

[3:32:15 PM]

one on February 3rd that we don't need those two that close together. And that we will also take off August 10th because that is during the budget time. We will reserve that time in case as we get closer we decide we need a meeting, but at this point in time we're going to recognize that we'll take that off. Do you have any questions, councilmember Gallo? Okay. So that's the motion on the table. I believe we

already have a motion. So all in favor? Okay. That's 4-0 adopting this council committee's schedule with the two adjustments that we made. Okay, the next item is a staff briefing on the status of the proposed taxi co-op. And let's see, we have -- we have three speakers -- wait, no. On item number 5 we have two speakers, but let's go ahead and have our briefing first so that the speakers have the benefit of hearing that and then we'll -- okay. >> Good afternoon, councilmembers. I'm Gordon, assistant director of the Austin transportation department and part-time Santa. [Laughter] >> Kitchen: Only part time? >> So [inaudible] Couldn't be with us today so I'm going to make this presentation. This is a follow on to an action by council back in may asking us to look at what we would need to do to set up a taxi co-op as an alternative for -- to the taxi franchises we currently have. So this bright group here -- so, with a co-op and looking around the country, all bids

[3:34:16 PM]

would be evaluated based on that framework as a cooperative. Now, last month -- and that's your response up there on the dais -- we've provided what we would use in the evaluation of the franchise proposals, and the number 1 item there on that would be -- is the proposal of cooperative, and if they don't meet that criteria, they would be at that point taken out of the process. So the rest of the criteria or what we use similarly when we renewed the rest of the taxi franchises last year -- or I guess earlier this year. Anyway, if you have any questions about that, we can answer, but one of the things we wanted to do is make sure the council is aware the evaluation criteria so that the posteriorly bidders would also be -- potential bidders would be aware of what's used to evaluate those items. So our proposed time line would be we provided the criteria last month, we're having a discussion now. We would advertise the potential franchise opportunities this month. Mid-january we would accept the franchise applications. We would tipped do that over a 45-day period -- typically. February to March we would be evaluating those. And we would come back to the council in March or April with a rank list of proposals for franchises. With the potential for the council to take action. >> Kitchen: And when you say back to the council, you bring it back to this committee and -- >> Yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So number of permits.

[3:36:20 PM]

You remember earlier in the year we were looking at service calls unmet within the taxi franchises. We felt a reasonable number was about 300, I think at that point our proposal was to allocate 100 between each of the franchises. The council decided to award 50 to each franchise and set aside the 150 for this new franchise opportunity, the co-op. So that's what our proposal is. Now, the urban transportation commission has made a recommendation to the council to move forward with the cooperative model as the alternative, but they decided that we needed 548 permits. And I'm not aware of calculus that was done to come to the 548 number, but we still think as staff that 150 is appropriate spot at least at this point for this potential new franchise. >> Garza: I have a question. >> Kitchen: Would you all like to hear from our speakers first and then ask questions or do you want to -- >> Garza: I just had a quick question about the 548. I missed that. Who came up with that number? >> The urban transportation commission. >> Garza: Okay. >> I don't think it was Jim, but he was there when it happened, so -- >> Garza: 548 for the co-op? >> Jim dale, assistant director of transportation department. Yes, at the last utc meeting when the discussions were occurring and the 548 permits recommended, there was a citizen who participated in speaking to the utc and had collected signatures, had done a petition and had 548 signatures of taxi cab, folks who would want to drive for the taxi co-op.

[3:38:21 PM]

From that the discussion continued and utc then voted on, made a motion for 548 petitions and voted on it and approved it. >> Garza: Thanks. >> Kitchen: I'll go ahead and ask a quick question, then let's have our speakers. I'm wondering whether -- whether it would be appropriate as part of your application process to -- to allow the companies that might be applying to -- to make a case for having more than 150. In other words, as part of the application process, you could put it out at 150, but as part of the application process they could ask for a certain number and then provide some justification as to why that number. And the reason I mention that is just because of our discussions last -- earlier in the year about trying to consider opening -- opening up more, the possibility of those permits. And at that time we did pass some language that is to be implemented in the future that would allow for additional permits for cab companies provided they met certain performance criteria. So I'm just -- I'm just thinking out loud here thinking as a way of providing some feedback, it might be appropriate during this application process to -- to allow for -- to allow for a proposal to make an argument for more. Not that it would be guaranteed or not, but then it could be evaluated as part of the process. >> We can certainly look at that. We would want to make sure the business model worked at 150. >> Kitchen: Sure. >> If theory, if it worked at 150, it would work at a larger number. But it really comes down to the council discussion and however many permits you want. But we'll certainly work with the city attorneys drafting the evaluation criteria so that can be open.

[3:40:22 PM]

>> Kitchen: That way it would allow flexibility and the decision could be made after that instead of a hard and fast requirement as part of the application process. So should we go ahead and hear from -- okay, so first we have Jennifer Mcphail. >> I'm Jennifer Mcphail. I'm with adapt of Texas. And we just wanted to come before you today to strongly advocate that whatever type of model you put forth with the co-op, that it be -- that it provide equivalent service for people with disabilities. And we had heard discussions in the past of there being a co-op that specifically only served people with disabilities and I don't think that that model would -- by segregating people and offering a segregated service, I don't think that model would necessarily succeed. We want to see a model that would succeed because it doesn't benefit anyone to have something that would be Saturday of a para transit service. And that just doesn't seem very effective for a taxi cab company. And the importance of having it achieve equivalent service for people with disabilities equivalent to nondisabled passengers is that the better that we move goods and services in the local community the stronger our economy. The same with people, the better we move people, the better off they are economically. When you can't move around the city the same as everyone else, then you don't have the same job opportunities or school opportunities or just opportunities to go out and have fun recreationally and put money back into the economy. The better we move, the better it is for Austin's economy and we want to encourage that and

[3:42:22 PM]

see more of that across every type of model of taxi cab service and/or tnc or anything. The better we move, the better it is for society. So just wanted to remind you have that. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. Next we have Mr. Sulivitz. >> Hello, I'm also with adapt of Texas and I want to echo what Jennifer said is that any model has to be equivalent service whether it be tnc, whether it be cab company, whether it be a co-op cab company because it just makes economic sense, it makes actual practical sense because -- you may wonder why I have this brace on right now. On October 3rd I was walking on the sidewalk unable to get a cab at that point, walking home, and on east 7th and Chicon, less than a block away from my home, a car took a turn on to Chicon, 40 miles an hour, struck me,

tipped me over, which resulted in broken ribs and a spinal fracture. And if I was able to have a reliable transportation option at that point, I would not have been injured and spent, you know, six weeks in the hospital. So it also makes practical sense. Because even though my wheelchair is very tall and you all see it, people with disabilities and people that use chairs get struck in the city every day. That's all I have to say. >> Kitchen: Thank you so much for coming out today. I'm so sorry that that

[3:44:22 PM]

happened to you and I really appreciate you coming to speak with us today. So and we all wish you the fastest recovery possible. And if there is anything we can do for you, please let us know. Mr. Durr, I have a followup question. Could you speak to the concerns raised about equivalent service, one of the criteria we're looking at for this co-op? >> It's contained within the taxi franchise ordinance that they have to provide that level of service. I made a note, we want to already particularly ask them how they are going to provide that within the co-op model. I think that's an important question to ask as part of the implication process. So we'll make sure that's included in there. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions that anyone has? Okay. Thank you very much. And thank you all for being here. All right, we'll move on to the next item, which is item number 6, a a briefing on the park and ride projects. >> Madame chair, to do hemmingson, strategic planning capital metro and it's a pleasure to be here and give you an update on our various park and ride efforts. So just briefly, I want to talk about why park and rides as they fit into the overall transit system, where we are today and then some of the future projects and programs, and at any time welcome any questions you all may have. Why park and rides? Park and rides are not a be all end all, they are not the only piece of a transit system

[3:46:23 PM]

perhaps, obviously, but they are an important element in suburban or outlying areas where traditional public transportation, bus running on a fixed route, may not be the right approach. So there's many cases where it makes more sense really to have opportunities for folks to essentially bring themselves to the transit system via a park and ride and then be able to use the transit network to get into and out of the urban core, for example. So park and rides generally are for commute trips, which could be work or school, and we're seeing that pattern emerge over time, but if you look across the country, that's the general nature of these services. And for that reason it's mostly found they offer Monday through Friday peak period service. We have several routes that one all day and far more park and rides here in Austin. And park and rides don't have to be stand alone, but they can be combined with other transit center functions where multiple routes come together so people can make connections between the different services. Some of the things we think about when we plan and build and construct and maintain park and rides, these are just a few of the factors we consider, they can be expensive so where we can we try to find economies of scale partnerships, such as using existing right-of-way rather than buying new -- new property, for example, and coordinating them with other projects such as major roadway projects. One of the challenges can be that the trip patterns can be directional. That means what you often see in the morning, for example the trips going inbound will be very full, but the buses coming back out are perhaps empty or not nearly as crowded. The reverse happens in the afternoon. That's kind of a traditional

[3:48:24 PM]

model. Again, we're trying to shift that over time so that we see a better two-way utilization of the services we offer. One of the key things that can help make them more effective, of course, is to have

transit priorities so the buses when they travel from the park and rides to their destination aren't stuck in traffic. That's been a big point of emphasis for us here recently. Some of the things we've been looking at, we look at best practices across the country. One of them is what's called the direct connection or a t-ramp. Here's an example from the Houston area. You can see in the circled area on the graphic there that the buses are able to access directly to the express lanes on the facility, and that is a huge benefit because absent that feature in the A.M. Or P.M. Period when there is a lot of traffic, the buses may be able to enjoy the benefit of the express lane, but once they try to get to the park and ride they get stuck in traffic. This feature while it's a significant capital investment can make a significant difference in the quality of the service the transit agency can offer. Another thing we're seeing across the country is where possible it makes sense to share your parking. That way the transit agency doesn't have to necessarily absorb all the costs of the parking. In this case I believe from the Denver area, the transit center itself is where the red icon is there on kind of the left side of the graphic, and then that large parking area [inaudible] Transit center and the mixed use transit oriented development to the right of the slide is shared parking. Common uses that can share parking with park and rides are movie theater for example. They need it in the evenings. Park and ride people need it during the day. Similarly churches need it on the weekends, but park and ride can use out the weekdays. There are good opportunities

[3:50:25 PM]

for shared parking. We do have some of those arrangements here in our system. And then I think the ultimate big picture plan for park and rides is really that you don't just build a surface parking lot and leave it like that forever, but you work with land use planning, things like the activity center plan, imagine Austin and the campo plan to develop these from a park and ride, which may be kind of the initial investment, but over time converting that into a transit oriented development. That way you can create a destination and not just a point of origin so you can make better use of your system, and also again I think this is very supportive of concepts like activity centers. This example here is up in Leander where we have a surface parking lot today with about 600 spaces, but we're actively working with the development community and city of Leander and others to do a conversion. This is a conceptual site plan on the right, but with ACC locate directly adjacent, this type of development pattern, we believe, will ultimately be emerging. So take what was a temporary use of a park and ride and something of much more community value in the long term. Just to sort of recap of what we have today, we have 14 park and rides throughout our system. They range from very small of less than 50 spaces to very large of more than 500. Some of our peer cities that we looked at, Houston for example has some park and rides with more than 2,000 spaces. We're not quite as large as some of those, but we do have a couple of really large ones. Our oldest is really no longer functioning as a park and ride. Back in the day when it was built, it was kind of on the edge of town. That's the north Lamar transit center at north Lamar and 183. Now, of course, that's almost in the center of Austin by some people's standards. So that's kind of, again, represents the transition

[3:52:25 PM]

there. There we're actively looking to see opportunities [inaudible] It's only about 30% full, so we're looking at working with development partners to redevelop that into something again with a higher community value. The [inaudible] Park and ride we built in manor. It's on the rail line so has a future potential as a rail station. Now it's serving for a park and ride for a fairly limited in manor. Our largest out in Leander and the busiest is our lake line park and ride. That's both [inaudible] Local bus routes as well as the metro rail service. That one is way over capacity and we have about 112% by our calculations

where we have people parking in places where they are not supposed to be parking because the demand is so great. This map just kind of recaps what I just covered that shows the different park and rides throughout our network and the types of services that serve them. I won't elaborate on that. This one then just summarizes in a slightly different format showing the connecting services, the metro rail in bright red has a number of park and rides up and down it. We have the metro rapid service and then our express bus services are in that darker maroon color. So looking to the future -- yes, I'm sorry. Missed that. Gallon I was going to ask a question before you moved on to the future. I know if I was one of the appointees to capital metro I probably would know this already. So on these locations that are

[3:54:26 PM]

further outside of the city area, I'm looking at the one northwest, cedar park and Leander. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Gallo: Do those communities participate in the costs that we incur in building the park and rides and do they also participate in the capital metro budget? >> So in -- two cases. In the case of Leander yes to both, they do participate in capital metro. They joined back in '85 when we were created and have been members ever since. Cedar park, on the other hand, joined in '85 and later withdrew from the capital metro so we do not have active service in the cedar park area. We run the train and the buses run what we call closed doors. There's no stops within cedar park, but at the same time we know that cedar park residents do access the service either from a nearby park and ride in some cases. So we've talked to mayor Powell about that. He's war of it as well and we always are looking for opportunities to work with him. The one opportunity that stops in cedar park serves the ACC pus and we have an agreement with ACC and they pay a supplement for that route on their campus. >> Gallo: So if a community is not participating in the sales tax revenue, I guess that's the funding stream that they owned out -- opted out of. >> Yes. >> Gallo: Is the cost of fare higher for that population? >> It's a good question. It's one we've looked at in a number of ways and we've followed the effort of other agencies to differentiate, but it's very difficult to id people every time they board the bus, for example. One of the experiments we followed was dart up in Dallas.

[3:56:26 PM]

They were charging folks that did not live in the service area to park at their park and rides, and they did a pilot experiment for I think a year about two years ago and what they ended up finding was the cost of administrating and tracking and followup and so on was exceeding the revenue gained and the good will that they lost from charging. And so they abandoned that plan. That doesn't mean it's not going to come up again in the future. It is an issue and we hear about it from -- from not only the city of Austin but member communities like Leander that kind of see we're paying in, why do they not have to pay extra or something. It is an issue, but to date there hasn't been a great resolution to it. >> Gallo: Are you continuing to look at potential solutions or options for that or are we just kind of at this point at a standstill and not doing anything? >> We're always keeping our eye out and we keep track of what other peer agencies are doing, and if and when we see good ideas, we consider them for application here. >> Gallo: Is cedar park the only one that's opted out, only one of our neighbors that have opted out? >> No, I believe -- hmm, I don't remember off the top of my head. There are a number of suburban communities who are not members, but I don't remember -- I can get you that information. >> Gallo: And I wanted to ask this question before we move into the future plans because as you talk about the future plans, would you help make us aware of if those future plans are in communities that are currently not participating? >> Yes. In fact, that will be covered in the very last slide. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> I have a related question. >> Sure. >> And I don't remember the whole scope of the service plan study. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Kitchen: Does that -- would

[3:58:26 PM]

that impact on the issue that councilmember Gallo is raising? >> Yes. In fact, that came up in discussion about what we're now calling connections 2025. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> The study that is now underway. And, yes. One of the things we'll be looking at is, because their scope is to look at our whole system of service -- >> Kitchen: Right. >> One of the questions is, are there big gaps because there are areas in the region that need service that aren't part of capital metro. And so, that will be one of the things they look at. >> Kitchen: Councilmember Gallo, that's the service plan study that is pretty broad-scope in looking at the services that cap metro provides that will be occurring over the next year. So, thank you for flagging that issue. And we can talk further about that particular issue, whether there's some sort of resolution that makes sense. >> Sure. While we're on the subject, I may as well briefly cover the approach we're taking with the nonmember communities. It's complicated in part by the fact that because of state cap on sales tax, even if they wanted to join capital metro today, they really could not. The only way they can join -- because they have to have a full penny available. So, under state law, they could not say, we want a quarter-cent worth of service, for example, or a half-cent worth of service. That's not possible. There's lots of issues even if it were. But, for them to join today, they'd have to rescind existing tax and replace it with capital metro tax. Politically and otherwise, that's challenging. Dallas and others have gone to the state legislature to try to remedy that, but, nothing has happened. The approach we're taking is we're working with them. We believe that having a regional system is in the best

[4:00:27 PM]

interest of our community. And so, some of the federal dollars we receive actually are attributable in part to areas that are not within the capital metro service area, but within the urbanized area. For those communities within the urbanized area, we can share some federal dollars, provided they work with us to develop a transit development plan. Basically, those are actively underway in Georgetown, pflugerville, Round Rock, and butte right now. So, each of those communities, we're helping with some federal funding to brick in a consulting team -- bring in a consulting team, help them put together a transit plan. If they choose to implement a transit plan, we will help participate in the cost of that with the federal funding, up to their -- the portion that's attributable to their population. So the formula basically allocates it that way, to the urbanized area, not strictly to capital metro. So we have a program in place that's actively working. Georgetown recently completed their plan, and as one example, they identified several routes they'd like to create. And they are now weighing whether they want to make that investment or not. Hutto is just completing theirs. They said one of their priorities is a connection into Austin. So, we're working with them on how to fund that, but our position is that local sold tax dollars collected in the capital metro service area stay within the capital metro service area. The only dollars that we are willing to, basically, share beyond the capital metro service area are those federal dollars that are, in fact, attributable to the whole urbanized area, if that makes sense.

[4:02:27 PM]

>> [ Off mic ]. >> That's a good point. We have partnerships with capital area rural transportation system, carts, providing service in a multicounty area surrounding the urbanized area. We have several routes we operate with them. For example, a route on the east side that begins in Elgin runs as a carts route until manor, and that becomes a capital metro route and continues into downtown. We have a similar route on the southeast part of town -- excuse me, town. Same type of arrangement. So, we do

have work with carts, but our overarching premise in all this -- we've worked with we don't want to essentially become the bay area, where we have 26 different transit systems operating in a metropolitan area, which has been -- when we talked to our peers out there, it's not the approach they recommend. We are trying to say let's work together from a customer experience perspective. It should be seamless, whether you're within or without, your trips should all work together, not have a route from one provider come here and the other one goes there, and they don't ever meet. So we try to minimize the chances of that happening by working in partnership with these nonmember cities. That was a long-winded answer. I'm sorry about that. Let me move on, then, to looking to the future a little bit about some of the work we have underway. We started really taking an in-depth look at our park & ride needs in the last service planning effort. So, as chair kitchen referenced the current one we just started, we'll take a revisit of that. In 2010, our service plan 2020 did a market analysis. That's what this table basically summarizes. We looked at the various

[4:04:29 PM]

corridors, how many trips come into the downtown area -- and downtown, generally downtown, the state capital complex and university of Texas. How many jobs are in that area, and then we did basically a ranking. So, as you can see -- and not surprisingly, far and away, the two leading corridors were north and south. That's just the nature of our metropolitan area, we're pretty linear north-south, where most of the travel is occurring. So, that has led some of our focus in terms of where we are planning future park & rides. And the rest of them shake out as the table there indicates. Some of the other work we've been doing with project connect and our system-planning effort, we identified a number of new park & rides, including our north corridor study, which looked beyond the service area and ultimately identified new park & rides in pflugerville, Hutto, Georgetown, and round Rock. And then, more recently, we've been working with the city of Austin which initiated the I-35 study, and then txdot has taken the lead on it. We've been working with them to think holistically and comprehensively about building these corridors rather than just build them for autos and then try to retrofit transit after the fact. We think it makes a lot more sense to think multimodally and holistically and build the transit in, the evidence is clear we can't build our way out of congestion assuming a single-occupant vehicle alone. The ability to put 80 or 40 or even 20 people on one bus versus 20, 40, or 80 cars can make a significant difference in helping manage congestion. So, we've been working with them on those different efforts. I'll speak to some of those momentarily. We did hear from mayor Adler,

[4:06:31 PM]

specifically, as well as councilmember kitchen about after November that we really need to look at serving the entirety of the community, after we had that effort that some people took to be really heavily focused on the urban core. And then, as we have discussed, we'll be looking at it again in the connections 2025 effort. Some of the studies or actual projects, lake line station, exceeding capacity. We have an expansion project in engineering, soon to be in construction for that site. Similarly, at Howard station, we have plans to add some additional spaces there, also. That one is over capacity. Great hills is a case where we've partnered with a church. They use their parking lot extensively on the weekends, of course, but it's basically empty on the week days, so we've had a long-standing arrangement with the church, and we're looking to add some additional spaces there. That is number 3 on the map, on the 183 corridor -- north 183. At south congress, we have a transit center there, but there is some park & ride functionality. We have a little bit of access land. We may be able to put 30 or some-odd spaces in there for folks that would like to access that via their automobile. And then at oak hill, we have an existing facility that is on txdot right of way, but when they do their, kind of, ultimate build project, that will have

to go away, because it is in the right of way. So we've been working to find possibly a permanent and temporary solution in that violent. -- vicinity. A couple other ones, west gate, an opportunity to put a park & ride under Ben white, in the right of way. We've been working with txdot on that. We have plans, conceptual

[4:08:33 PM]

engineering complete, we're working on agreement. We have the funding in place to make that project happen, and so that should move into development and construction in the near future. Then at south park meadows, which is a private shopping development, but with some public roads that travel through it, we have our route 801, metrorapid terminates there, we have a shared parking agreement now, but we're working on a longer-term lease option for some spaces, again, for commuters to part there and ride the metrorapid in. The mopac express lanes are under construction. Our Howard park & ride is already full. But we're looking, again, to do a lease agreement with a large church in that vicinity. It's right positioned very well. So the buses can load folks at that location, and basically get right into the express lanes and zoom down to downtown Austin. So that's one we're looking to kick off right as the express lanes open up, either later in 2016, or -- well, whenever ctrma has it ready to open. A couple longer-term initiatives to mention, we've also been working with ctrma on -- >> We have a question. >> I want to mention I really like the fact that you've got a concept that you continue, it looks like, to pursue, which is use existing parking, whether it's a church or an office building, or if it's something else -- or a grocery store that has extra parking. It just seems like such an efficient use of space when that's available, so it sounds like that's part of the thought process. >> Yes. >> Gallo: When you are looking at new space. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Gallo: You've mentioned two churches. Do you have the opportunity to look at commercial sites -- >> Yes.

[4:10:33 PM]

>> Gallo: Big home improvement centers or something, that they don't -- >> We do. We've had mixed success. In some cases, they've welcomed us and said yeah, that makes a good partnership. In other cases, it hasn't worked at all. In fact, they put up signs that say, no capital metro people can park here. It just depends on the situation. But we always look to that. There's pros and cons. I mean, the con is, if you establish a strong customer base -- and we had this happen in oak hill. Very successful park & ride. And then the owner decided he didn't want us there anymore. We had to scramble and find an alternative in very short order. It was disruptive to the customer base. For years they've gone here, and now they can't. There's some benefits to owning and controlling the property, but, certainly, from a cost effectiveness point of view, it does make sense. >> Okay. >> Again, just to summarize, I'm about done here. The longer-term initiatives, 183, again, we have a number of park & rides in this corridor with this project. We see significant transit benefits, mainly -- or in large part, obviously, because there'll be express lanes. That's the current proposal. Still subject to finalizing the environmental process. But those help the buses not be stuck in traffic. And then the ability to connect directly into the mopac lanes that are under construction. If everything goes to plan, then we would have, essentially, a congestion-resistant, if not congestion-proof path for a lot of express service from this corridor into central Austin. Then, in the southwest, we have -- as I mentioned, oak hill. We may have an interim solution. The long-term solution is a partnership with Austin community college and the large

[4:12:34 PM]

campus, the 40-some-odd acres they have in that area. And we are undergoing continued discussions

with them. We've talked with them for quite some time about building a transit center and park & ride into that ultimate master plan for that property. South mopac, multiple efforts underway, also. Working with ctrma on developing one or perhaps more than one park & ride longer-term in that corridor. And, again, the benefit -- we think anywhere we have an express lane where we can get our buses unstuck from traffic is very beneficial. >> Could -- >> Yes. >> I wanted to go back and ask some more about the south mopac project. >> Sure. >> I just wanted to speak -- I don't know if you heard one of the previous speakers' questions about that. So, how does this planning relate, or is it related in any way to the process that someone is going through for selecting an option for south mopac? Are these parallel tracts, are they planning together, or what's your perspective from cap metro's perspective? >> Sure. We have advocated for, from the outset, that transit should be built into this project. I know Justin is here from ctrma, so he can speak to it as well. We've asked for consideration of building a park & ride into the project, specifically at slaughter. We felt like that was a great location. They have done some conceptual designs. We've worked with their consultants on evaluating some options, but we haven't really cemented a deal, so to speak. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So we've had discussions and some progress, but nothing firmed up, if you will. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. >> And on that point -- and I think this point applies to all

[4:14:35 PM]

of these projects -- one of the things we've been trying to consistently get out there is the value we're bringing to the table is the service we provide and the people-moving. And to the degree that we can spend our limited resources on moving people rather than building facilities, we think that's an overall community benefit. Similarly, we've been working with txdot on the I-35 project for several years now. This is one example, again, where we think we can use existing right of way. In this case, at the intersection of 45 southeast and I-35, as a location for a park & ride. There are several others within the corridor, and we've been working with txdot and their consulting team on evaluating feasibility of other park & rides, but this is one we had done some conceptual engineering and asked them to include into their project. On the north end of the corridor, we have the existing tech ridge park & ride, which when we acquired that land, we bought a strip so that we could have a t-ramp or a direct connect, such as what I showed you earlier under the best practices portion. So, this was the wrap-up slide. It just shows, kind of, a regional -- I'm sorry the graphic is small and not necessarily easy to read. We can get you all a larger version if you'd like. But, longer-term we kind of took a look at where in the -- hopefully, foreseeable future -- we can have a whole regional network of park & rides. This includes ones that are within the capital metro service areas, as well as ones beyond. But given the nature of -- and the layout of our region, and the need -- the tremendous commuting and mobility needs, we think this type of system is what we'll need for the long-term.

[4:16:36 PM]

With that, I'll wrap up, and be glad to answer any other questions. >> Yes, go ahead. >> This map in a lot of ways reminds me of the project connect map, in that there is nothing in southeast Austin. So I'm just wondering, is there any plan, or really, east Austin. >> Well, a fair point. And part of the explanation is the nature -- and I should've said this upfront. Park & rides are one tool in the toolbox. And east Austin, while it doesn't show on this map, has a large amount of local service, because that's based on our analysis and experience. That's the most suitable -- at least in the closer-in portions of the east side. We have had discussions with your office about the potential for a park & ride near the airport, of course. With the news this week, in fact, of ACC buying that large piece of land just adjacent to the airport, right near I-30, that may be another opportunity for a partnership. So, while they're not explicitly shown here,

I will acknowledge that, it's not something off the table. But, at the same time, it's important to recognize that local service -- which may not require park & rides, or that may not even be the most suitable solution for certain areas of town. So, in some cases, park & rides are the best answer. In others, they may not be. But your point is heard and understood. >> Garza: Okay. >> Other questions? Any questions? Okay, thank you very much.

[4:18:39 PM]

>> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Appreciate it. Okay. Our next item is item number 7, which is a briefing by the rma on the Bergstrom expressway 183 south project. Now, this is item number 7, and I have one speaker. Is this the item that Mr. Bunch would like to speak to, or was it the next one? >> Next one. >> Kitchen: Okay. That's what I thought. Okay. Go ahead. >> Good afternoon, councilmembers, Justin with the central Texas regional mobility committee. I appreciate the ability to update y'all on a couple of our projects, the first being the 183 south project. This project is eminent to go to construction. I just want to walk you through some of the details shown here on the map. We're going from U.S. 290 in the north to 71 in the south for an eight-mile project length, and a total developer cost, that being design and construction, of \$582 million. If you look at the map, you can see our basic construction phasing shown there by the number 1. We're going to start in the north section and build from 290 down to bolm road, and the second phase, we'll do the southern half, from bolm road down to 71. I didn't start by saying, y'all are welcome to jump in with questions any time, so let me know if you have any. Overall, project schedule starting in 2015. Just one thing I want to point out on the left side. In may, we made the selection of the developer. They have been moving forward with their work. Just last week, we gave notice to proceed 2, giving them construction authorization. We expect them to move into the construction phase in the spring of 2016 next year. And we're looking at a completion of that northern section in the fall of 2019. And then about a year later to complete the entire job in the fall of 2020. Zooming in a little bit more, I just wanted to point out one thing of significance to us. We achieved our final financing and bond sale this month, so the project is fully funded and ready to move forward.

[4:20:40 PM]

This is a cross-section of what we are building here. The first graphic at the top is what's out there right now. If you're familiar, there's two general purpose lanes in each direction with signals at each major cross street. If you want to kind of envision what you're building, if you've been on the 290 east facility, that's very much what's going to be this project. So, in the center there you have three tolled main lanes in each direction. Those will be grade separated, high-speed facilities. Adjacent to that, we're building three non-tolled general purpose lanes, so that's an increase of two from the two that are out there now, to we're going to have a 50% increase in pavement there. And give you three lanes. In addition to that, there will be five-foot bike lanes on the outside in each direction. And in addition on the outside there of that bottom section, you'll see the six-foot sidewalk on one side, and a ten-foot shared use path on the other. We're very pleased, on this project, to have the right of way footprint to be able to provide those pedestrian facilities. This is a rundown of some of the overpass and cross street removals in. When you convert a facility like this from a signalized, non-access controlled facility where driveways and such can tie directly to the lanes, when you take that to what we're calling a freeway section, meaning a three main lanes and front age roads, if you will, that requires, generally, some changes in overpasses and the cross streets. And that's what we have here. There was a lot of coordination, especially related to the cross-street removal, and that primarily revolved around safety and operational considerations. But what we did, as a team, just, for example, on vargas street, in order to maintain a similar level of service for those folks that no longer have that cross street, we went in and added a Texas turnaround.

[4:22:41 PM]

That's a facility bridge structure where you can go in and before the signal, make your turnaround move. And that provides a very similar timeframe, equal to or better than what they may've had sitting through the light getting through that intersection. On the southern end, this is the very southern end, it's 71, the airport is to the top of the screen. We're going to be adding direct connectors, also known as flyovers, in that area that will provide a direct movement to and from 183 headed toward -- and to and from 35, essentially. We feel like that's a huge benefit. It's going to be doubly important as we move into I-35 construction in the coming years, and as folks may choose to use 183 as an alternate, that will provide fluid movement for that. We also are coordinating this project with an upcoming txdot project that will look at how to connect the airport along 71 in a more expeditious manner. I'll talk a little bit about the bike pad already, but, we're very pleased. You can see a rendering of the type of facility we're talking about with the bike lanes, on-street and the full shared use path on the outside. We have a very strong commitment as an agency. We do this whenever we can. This is a great example of where we have the footprint, and we're able to deliver approximately \$25 million in bike and ped improvements on this project. Another element, there are a number of trailheads that we have added on this project. Here's an example of a rendering. This is the Colorado river trail head, with the significant tie-in to adjacent bike ped facilities on the project, so it'll be a nice stop-in. We'll be rehabbing in this area, if you're familiar with the existing truss bridge that's carrying traffic right now, that's going to be a bike/ped bridge. We're going to rehab it. It's historic in nature. We want to preserve it. We're going to utilize it for

[4:24:45 PM]

bike/ped. Aesthetics, a big component. We hear a lot about that during the public involvement process. As a work through the context-sensitive approach on this project, we developed comprehensive aesthetic requirements. Our bridges and structures, we're going to have very unique design. Another big ask that we had from the community that we've addressed is improving the openness and the approachability, if you will, the ped ramp to the bridges that are out there now. There's one and we're going to be adding two more pedestrian structures, make those more inviting, make them -- safe, make people want to use them. We've put a lot of effort into that. On the lower right, there's a rendering of the typical cross-street treatment, where we'll do a bunch of consider considerable landscaping to add a lot of value to those intersections. Finally, as we move into construction, we find it's very important -- we take it incredibly seriously -- keeping the public informed about the project, construction activities, so they can -- we all know that construction is not without its impacts, but at least let people know what's coming, keep them informed, and give them the opportunity to look at other choices. You know, examples of the technology we use here are shown on the left. We Twitter. I'll use our mopac north project, the mopac improvement project as the example. If you go to that website, you can see a pretty regular Twitter feed that we're updating the community and keeping them up to speed. We have a project website for each of our projects. This one is [183south.com](http://183south.com). We post all sorts of information there, I highly recommend you check it out. We're very proud of them and try to keep a lot of information on them. We also have 24/7 project hotlines, send out emails and text alerts to folks that sign up for it, as well as newsletters. But I think the biggest thing we

[4:26:46 PM]

do, and we've found a lot of success on our mopac north project, is have a dedicated outreach person. If

y'all have been to our open houses or seen our mopac man, he's our boot on the ground that keeps everyone informed, keeps that Twitter feed going. And we have that same concept on this project, have a dedicated rma staffer that's going to be keeping the website up to date and very informative. You can't do a big project like this without a lot of partners. And we've worked closely with all the agencies shown here. I'm probably missing several others. Just at the city itself, just to run through a few watershed legal right of way transportation, Austin, the water utility, Austin energy, the parks and urban trails group, and fire/ems, just to name a few. An example of partnership, for the last year, we've been working closely on a number of ongoing utility relocations. This is a big project, there's a big utility budget. A lot of those are city of Austin water, wastewater, that's been an ongoing effort for about a year. It's been a great partnership. Very productive. And I wanted to thank acm Goode and his staff. They've been very, very helpful working through this project. >> Jason, could you remind us -- I know there's multiple funding sources for this project. Could you just remind us what those are? >> Generally, there are -- without getting into too much -- >> Kitchen: You don't have to get into the minutia. >> There's committed plan. It's been on the books for 20 years. There's a combination of txdot funds as well as loans. We closed our bond sale for \$370 million worth of bond revenues that the rma took out to bridge the gap between those

[4:28:46 PM]

available funding sources and what we needed to build the project. So it's a combination of, essentially, txdot, bond money, and campo. We have details, I'd be happy to send you backup. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> With that, again, I encourage everyone here to visit our website, 183south.com, and I'd be happy to answer any further questions. >> Zimmerman: Thanks. I'd like to tag onto what chair kitchen referred to with the funding. This has been in the works for more than a decade. Probably the funding arrangement, right, has been kind of discussed for many, many years. Recently, we had a constitutional election that I think moved some more money from our gas to txdot road funding, and there was a provision to not connect it to toll roads. So, are you aware of what I'm talking about, the constitution amendment? >> Yes. >> Zimmerman: How is that affecting your projects going forward? It doesn't affect this, but does it affect you going forward? >> That's a great question. And then there was a recent prop 7 initiative passed in November that will allocate various tax revenue sources, I believe, beginning in 2017. You know, with the non-toll provision, it could impact us. We're still, frankly, assessing what that means to us. So, I don't have a great answer, other than that will impact, and something we'll have to look at as we model the viability of future projects. >> Zimmerman: Okay. Quick question. Are you having to do any right of way access, or is there plenty of room to do everything you need to do? >> We are acquiring some parcels on this. It's a lot of slivers, if you will, and small corner clips. Collectively, I think it's a few acres in total for the whole project. And a few may be an

[4:30:47 PM]

exaggeration. It's a very small amount. >> Zimmerman: Very small. Okay. Yeah. >> We're very fortunate on this one to have a very good, preserved footprint. >> Zimmerman: In the last 15 years, I've lost a lot of my life sitting on 183 trying to get to the airport, so I'm really happy about this. >> Very good. >> Kitchen: Other questions? No? Okay, thank you. Now, I know we are up for our next one, right? >> I am. >> Kitchen: So, our last item -- or our next-to-last item, then we have two speakers for it. I think I'll go ahead and ask you to present, and then we'll have our speakers, and then we may have more questions for you, if that works for everyone. Okay. So this last item is the briefing on the city and the ctrma joint work on the mopac express lane project in the alternatives evaluation study process right now. So. Go for it. >> Very good, thank you. See if that comes up. So, since we were here last month, we held our

open house as we discussed. This was our November 10th open house held at the palmer event center. If y'all will bear with me, I'm going to have a lot of statistics here. I wanted to give y'all some hard data to chew on. We presented six alternatives, plus the no-build. That included the actual presentation items included 51 boards that showed the process and the concepts, 15 different renderings, three different traffic simulation video stations, one informational video station, and an additional five informational videos online. We had interactive CSS, contact sensitive solutions station. Six concept stations, that means the six alternatives, if you will, you were able to walk around each station and get a lot of information at those. We had a community survey and

[4:32:49 PM]

comment station. And then we had, also, representatives of the city of Austin transportation staff that were there as well, and the UT center for transportation research folks were there, as well. Very good representation. Starting at the top, we had a total of 180 different visitors. About 100 -- as a point of comparison, we had about 120 stakeholders at the February 2014 meeting, so we were pleased to see that we got some additional folks there. A lot of those -- as you can see we have an hour breakdown there. Three to four, four to five, and so on. We tracked that because really, we were looking to have the most effective meeting times for folks to show up. We varied it through time, and trying to figure out the best MIX of making it available for the public to attend. We did that -- this is our first one that we actually opened up at 3:00, earlier in the afternoon. Like I said, we had a hundred attendees arrive by 5:00 P.M. Over half our folks showed up before 5:00 P.M. That was very successful. We were happy to see that. At our virtual open house -- this ran in parallel, from October 21st to November 20th. We put, basically, the same content that was going to be at the physical open house on this virtual open house. Some of the stats from that, you can see the graph. That's sessions, if you will, through time. That blue graph at the top. We had a total of 2,554 sessions. You can just think of those as visits to the website. >> Kitchen: Okay. And that would exclude rma and team visits, so those are true members of the public, if you will. Users spent about six minutes per session, which is a pretty substantial amount of time. We had a total of 9642 page views. So those are individual pages that folks, as they tooled through in their session, looked at different pages.

[4:34:49 PM]

Just points of comparison from our previous open house, it had a ten-day duration with 1811 sessions, a total of three pages viewed per session, an average of three minutes and 34 seconds for each of those. And then about 4600 page views. So, we about doubled all of our stats for this open house. >> Kitchen: You may be getting to this, but how many comments does that translate into? Or are you -- >> I'll hit on that probably on the next slide, I believe. >> Kitchen: Okay. That's fine. >> Something we did differently here, we have not done this before. But we actually opened up the virtual open house to allow a full 30 days. Typically our virtual open house comes up at the same time that our actual, physical open house is put on. And then you have ten days to view it. Due to Nepa requirements, the national environmental protection act requirements, and the process, we weren't allowed to change the ten days after the meeting for the comment period. But we thought, hey, let's get this out there and get out in the public as soon as possible, and give folks a chance to go to the website, see what they're going to see, and come better-informed and come with great questions. And I think doubling of all our stats speaks to that. And we're very happy with it. There we go. So, as of 11/23, we had 778 comments transcribed and counted. I will tell you toward the very end, we received an overwhelming number of additional comments that we are going through the process of transcribing. So, I don't have a total count right now. The team is actually going through that process. >> Kitchen: Do you have any idea of order of

magnitude? Is it going to double this, or is it going to -- >> I don't. It'll be in excess of a thousand. It could be a doubling.

[4:36:50 PM]

We just don't know at this point. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I do want to just give a flavor of the type of comments that we're seeing, general themes. We had about 500 comments about the two express lanes in each direction, just general, all sorts of different comments. About 450 of these 778 talking to the connection to downtown, both for and against. About 270 for environmental impacts overall, visual, air, wildlife, parkland, etc. And about 73 so far dealing with tolling. So, just kind of general themes in a lot of what we're seeing, is what we saw there. So, going through next steps, we're going to continue to analyze those comments as part of the environmental process. We put together an open house summary and a comments response. It's a pretty voluminous document where we address each of the comments that come to us, so you can imagine, if we're looking at a thousand plus comments, it takes a while to address those. So we're going to work through that. We'll then move through and narrow the configuration options based on evaluation criteria that are really fundamental to the purpose and need of the project, taken together with that public input process. And then once that boils down over the coming months, then we'll report those results back to the community and gather additional feedback. So, with that, I will be happy to answer any more questions. >> Kitchen: I think we'll take public -- so we had some public public -- comment and come back to questions. First we had bill bunch, and then after him, Melissa shinker.

[4:38:57 PM]

>> Thank you, councilmembers. I'm bill bunch with save our springs alliance. And also the key mopac local coalition. We help facilitate many hundreds of comments into the process. Overwhelming message from the folks that we facilitated, and people who just signed on to our message as well, was that we choose none of the above. On the six tolled options, and then the do nothing option. We feel like it's really time to step back and put some non-tolled options on the table for further study that could actually help reduce congestion for everybody, rather than the tolled options, all six of which, if you look at their information, they say this, that congestion gets much, much worse for everybody on the free lanes in the years ahead with this project. The only people who benefit are the ones who are paying the tolls. And they further say that those tolls, during peak hour, can surge up to \$12 an hour, and it's \$12 one way. That's on their two-lane option each way, two lanes each way. If you go to the one lane each way, they're predicting tolls could jump up to 17, \$18 one way. So, in a city that claims to be concerned about affordability, we are going in the wrong direction with these roads. In a city that's obsessed about congestion, we're talking about spending literally hundreds of millions of dollars to expand mopac and congestion gets 50 to

[4:41:00 PM]

100% worse, according to their models, unless you are far enough out so you can actually access the tolls, and then be able to afford to pay them. A critical issue, also, that people were concerned about was impacts on dumping this additional traffic on the Cesar Chavez. They put out a study from the center for transportation research, they have some good folks there. But the report was written in a way to really disguise the conclusions. But there's a table in there -- and you can look at it. And it says point blank that you get better traffic flow -- higher volume of throughput -- with the no-build option. And the way you explain that is what everybody understands. It's overwhelming Cesar Chavez. All conditions -- [

beeping ] >> Of build make it worse. Could I just take one more minute? >> Kitchen: Yes, go right ahead. >> Thank you. We have put a tremendous amount of work into this effort. The handout I gave you is a study of HOV lanes in Dallas, and how well they're functioning. And using the pavement more efficiently. And speeding up bus travel times, because I know that's a great concern. We've been ignoring these, in part because a few years ago, there wasn't any money over at txdot. I was very happy to hear the conversation from y'all just a minute ago that things are changing right now. So we've got a big chunk of money to txdot last year, with the constitutional amendment. We got a new chunk this month for non-tolled projects. And so we need to step back and say, hey, you know, we don't have to do toll roads anymore.

[4:43:01 PM]

That was the perception when we got started on this path a couple years ago. It's changed radically. We're about to have a big national transportation bill go through, that was in the paper today with some funding. That could change the situation. And then, we're getting more and more information about how these variable tolls are -- they're really limousine lanes that really don't help the community in a way that HOV lanes, which can be done very quickly and efficiently, and improve the efficiency of our projects. And my last point, which I'll touch on just on the 183 project, we're putting a whole lot of very limited taxpayer dollars into these toll roads. It's a gross misperception that the future toll collections are paying for these projects. They're paying for a fraction of them. And if I understood the answer to the question on the previous project, about \$200 million is coming out of our limited campo pot, out of that 570, and only 300 or so is coming from the debt backed by toll collections. We haven't seen what they're estimating the breakout would be on south mopac. But what we really need is a comprehensive study looking at the whole thing instead of chopping it up in pieces as the council has resolved before. So, I hope you'll look at that more closely, and perhaps consider bringing a resolution back to the council along those lines. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Melissa shinker. >> Hi, councilmembers. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you about this project. My name is Melissa shinker, and I'm the parent of a student as

[4:45:01 PM]

Austin high school. And I'm on the traffic and safety committee of the high school. And I'm here to talk about some of the concerns that the high school has about the proposals that ctrma has put forth. What I'd like to do first is give you some information, just about the context that the high school is in so that you have an understanding of why we have the concerns that we have. The high school has been in Austin since 1881. It's said to be one of the oldest high schools in the country, west of the Mississippi. It's been at its current location since the 1970s. Otherwise, it's in parkland, it's a hundred-year flood plain, at the intersection of Cesar Chavez and mopac. The school relies on the agreements with way and with the city of Austin for access to athletic facilities. And these are crucial to the high school maintaining its status as a comprehensive high school. Without the access to the ball fields at way, and the parkland, the school would not be a comprehensive high school, which means it wouldn't be able to participate in uyl competitions. And there's only one other high school in the city that isn't comprehensive, so it would greatly impact the school fits access to the parkland was challenged. The high school community uses veterans drive, which right around the high school, is Steven F. Austin boulevard. It has an agreement with the city to keep that road open for public use. And the public uses that a great deal for access to the hike and bike trails. The traffic on that roadway is really crazy. It's a high-use road with

[4:47:05 PM]

pedestrians walking on the roadway itself, students going back and forth across the road to get to the athletic facilities, and a lot of traffic. And in the afternoons, the wait to get out of that little half circle can be 15 minutes to 20 minutes to get onto Cesar Chavez, or under Cesar Chavez to get on to mopac. And going the other direction, it can be up to 45 minutes. That's a really common wait time where people are stuck down in that little bowl right there right at Austin high. School buses access the same roads that the students and the parents do. And we do this at the same time that the use is really heaviest with park users. [ Beeping ] >> I'm sorry. >> Kitchen: If you can take just another minute or so to wrap up. >> Okay. We also have inexperienced drivers added to that MIX. And the number of driveways, driveways, egress and ingress is extensive. Three of the current proposals envision lanes being built closer to the high school than currently. One of them would be 24 feet closer with 5 extra feet needed for construction. That's very close. The roadway is already close to the northeast side of the school. And we would likely lose the green space barrier between the roadway and the high school, so students in the cafeteria, the library, the performing arts center, and classrooms on the north side of the school would hear and see the cars going past on the road. School buses aren't being offered the same free access to the express lanes as city buses are, and that is a concern. We are concerned that the

[4:49:05 PM]

additional traffic coming onto Cesar Chavez will cause a number of problems. Student safety is of paramount importance, and students walk from the school over to the way facilities, and that pedestrian safety is crucial to us. The ctrma heard concerns expressed in the spring by Austin high school about the direct connect to Cesar Chavez where it comes in. In earlier proposals, it would've come in at a spot that would've encouraged people to move across -- try to move across three or four lanes of traffic to get into the Austin high area. So they have moved that, but given the configuration, people who are coming from the south to Austin high would need to get off the highway at Barton skyway, and so the toll lanes may not be that useful to parents who are coming to Austin high. And there's also concern about the variable pricing of the toll lanes being something that would be problematic for members of our community, making it not a very attractive alternative, and putting them on the general use lanes that are congested. We're also concerned about just what seems to be lack of coordination and effective ideas for how that traffic would come from south mopac into downtown. The coordination with the city of Austin -- I mean, we just don't really know what proposals are there to help make that whole system work better. And we are concerned because additional traffic is likely to use that Cesar Chavez loop underneath Cesar Chavez that's right there at the entrance to

[4:51:05 PM]

the school to get onto the express lanes. Traffic from terrytown and possibly west lake would likely use that to get on to the south express lane, so it would add more traffic to the teeny loop that has so much use by Austin high. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I've summarized most of our issues. Thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Does anybody have any questions for her? Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Do we have any questions for Jason? I know that -- I believe our Austin transportation department staff had submitted some comments. I don't know if you want to make any comments at this point or not. It's up to you. >> No, that's fine. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I'll just remind the committee that back in the spring, Austin transportation provided a request for central Texas regional mobility authority to look at a range of different access ideas. They actually have looked at those. Many of them have been incorporated into their alternatives. That's how they went from one build to six builds. Not all of the ideas that the city of

Austin presented have turned out to be viable. One specific one, the added general purpose -- lanes across the lake. When we sent that request in, we did not have the advantage of the time to do the engineering on it. Subsequently, the impact from those lanes looks like it doesn't match the return on the investment that they provide. So, we continue to be pretty encouraged by the number of different elements that we were able to bring forward that have been included in all the alternatives. So, you know, we continue to coordinate closely with them. With regards to the traffic on Cesar Chavez, we have made some proposals in the interchange that I think are still under

[4:53:06 PM]

consideration, loop ramp access off of lake Austin that could take all those turns that are now left-turning and put them into a right hand and get them out of the intersection. That would certainly help Austin high school, we believe, along with some other improvements in the area that are still under consideration. >> Kitchen: Okay. Could you -- can you remind us the timeframe? I know you reported that to us in our last meeting, but can you just remind us again the timeframe for bringing forward the preferred alternative? >> We would go through the process. I would say sometime in the spring would be the earliest opportunity, when we might come back out to the public with that alternative. There's quite a bit of work -- background work -- to be done in that regard. And, again, stakeholder outreach and all that. But I would think spring would be an appropriate timeframe, spring to early summer. >> Kitchen: Okay. So there's no specific deadline at this point. >> No. It's really a function of getting through the process, and then reaching out again to -- we've had a great -- we've had a lot of meetings with Austin high, and those are going to continue as we continue to look to address their concerns. We've made geometric and specific changes to try to limit those movements to and from the ramps she was referring to. There's still work to be done. We're going to continue to work with those stakeholders. That process, as we see public comments and see an issue, we start working through those. >> Kitchen: Okay. I have one question I want to follow up on, some discussion that we had earlier. That had to do with the park & ride. If you could speak to that again, I think one of the questions that we were talking about was the -- you know, the express lanes and the benefit offered to the bus system is one of the rationales behind the

[4:55:07 PM]

project. And so if you could speak to the planning process, and the potential, and the approach to planning for the park & rides at the same time. >> Absolutely. So, I would consider transit one of the linchpins of the reason we're doing the project as an express lane. We're very pleased that the last open house got clearance from txdot to actually show two -- as Todd mentioned, we were looking at two sites on south mopac to potentially put in sites of a very preliminary nature. It was generous of txdot to let us show those kind of conceptual -- it's a little bit out of the Normal process, so we appreciate them letting us show that. We have been very pleased, Todd and have staff have been involved in many, many of our meetings, not just on mopac south, but really, our entire system of planning. So they've been a great partner, and very pleased to have them as a part of that. More recently, we've taken a very active role in transit planning. We've actually engaged real estate experts and transit planning experts to help augment and supplement Todd's work, and work closely with him. We're taking a regionally wide look at park & ride facilities throughout the city and the region. We're going through and looking at siting options, at access options, and thinking through and beyond just the roads we're improving, but how do we get transit going region-wide. So we're very serious about it. We're expending funding to make it happen. And that's an ongoing effort in coordination with cap metro. >> Kitchen: Can that be -- or is that part of the alternative that will come forward? In other words, is that part of the planning to see where

the park & rides might go? >> It is. Whether or not -- we'll talk about mopac south specifically. Whether we can come to a conclusion about a suitable site within the window of opportunity for the environmental doc on

[4:57:08 PM]

mopac south, I don't know the answer to that. We may not be able to. The more important thing is that we are willing and ready to take on a separate environmental process, region-wide for each of these park & ride locations, to clear and get them built, acquire property, whatever we need to do to help facilitate cap metro. So, we're taking, I guess, a broader view of transit planning, and not just, hey, can we roll it into our roadway projects. How do we become part of the plan outside of that process. >> Kitchen: Okay. Yeah. I think the concern is -- and thank you for your effort. I'm not meaning to suggest that the rma is not working on that. I'm curious about the timing and the connection between the projects so that we don't end up with one project, and then maybe at some point later, the park & ride, you know. >> Right. We're endeavoring to get that in the project. At this point, it's hard to say. Working with Todd, there's a number of operational issues that -- or engineering issues that we're working through to get a functional -- it has to be safe. It has to carry the capacity we need. And some of the alternatives have challenges, so we're working through those. And that's why it's hard to commit. I say more broadly, we're committed to getting one done regardless of the path on which mopac south goes. We want transit and park & ride in that area, so we're pushing that forward, both with the project and in a separate planning effort. >> Kitchen: Okay. Do y'all have any? Go ahead, councilmember. >> The Austin high parent that was here speaking to us, thank you -- addressed the issue of the school buses. Do they not have the same priority on our toll lanes as the city buses will have? >> At present, they do not. I apologize, I can get you background information on the rationale there. Primarily, transit-oriented buses and registered van pools are intended to facilitate that transit element on the express lanes. >> Gallo: So what would be the

[4:59:09 PM]

process if we wanted to evaluate including the school buses on that? >> I would suggest >> I would suggest I go back to my shop because we have information ob that I apologize. I don't have I don't have it open hand. We'll get that to you and that will be an ongoing discussion item. >> Gallo: I would like to see that, thank you. >> Kitchen: I would like to see that also. Also, as part of that, if you can help us understand, where's that decision made? In other words, it's part of what -- whose requirements? Is it state? Is it federal? Is it our own? >> Absolutely. We'll get y'all that information. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I did want to hit on, if you don't mind, address one of the comments. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I would agree with Mr. Bunch and his statements that traffic is going to get worse. I think we all agree with that reality. One thing I did want to maybe modify of his statements, the addition of the express lanes will actually have a positive impact when you think about it just intuitively, when we take those folks out of the general purpose lanes and on toll lanes that are there and get them moving in the express lane, our models are showing we do nothing in 20345, I believe, we're looking at about 50 something minutes for the travel time from slaughter to the exit to Cesar Chavez. And without quoting exact Numbers, the general purpose lanes themselves benefit on the order of about 20 minutes of reduction overall, depending on the alternative, 15 to 25, I think is about what it runs, reduction from that 50 minutes. So the non-tolled option definitely receives a benefit and reduction in travel time from the express lanes by virtue of taking that traffic off of the general purpose lanes. >> Kitchen: >> Gallo: And -- thank you for pointing that out. >> Sure. >> Gallo: I remember hearing that analysis done on 183 and 183a. So was that the case there when you went back and studied after 183a was constructed? >> Yes. And you can --

most -- it's

[5:01:09 PM]

most clear on even our 290 east project, excuse me, most similar to the 183 south where you have a facility where we've upgraded the non-tolled elements. We've seen tremendous capacity and improvement in the travel times in those non-tolled sections. >> Garza: What -- you mentioned, if nothing is done, it could be a 56 minutes from slaughter to Cesar Chavez. What are those models? I guess how are those models done? Because are there assumptions made in there, for example, if there's more sprawl, there's more sprawl going on right now, lots of development. And that's really based on the market. So are any assumptions made regarding if the market tanks and that development stops then, yes, obviously, we would have a static amount, same amount of traffic on there. But if -- and, you know, all estimations show that the market is not tanking any time soon, that development is going to continue outside of Austin, which means more cars, which means -- I'm having a hard time with the argument that it's gonna get worse so we have to do something because I saw a statistic at a conference lately where California invested billions in this highway that changed cars from going 18 miles an hour to 19 and a half. And so I'm just -- so are there assumptions made when we come one that 56-minute -- >> Sure, absolutely. And I think that's the essential element of transit in this, just to speak to your one-minute improvement, after spendion a lot of money, our hope is we get people on busses and just to use a recent Georgia example, in their express lanes they have about 2% buses utilizing their facility but carrying 24-26% of the people so there's a

[5:03:10 PM]

real opportunity there to realize a the lo of gains. There's two fundamental assumption that's go into these models. We assume with when we do them every road in the campo plan for 2040 at this point is built and then we also have expert demographers as part of the team that look at the growth trends and do their best. I mean, it's somewhat reading of the tea leaves as you estimate, based on their past trends and expert training they look at trends and extrapolate that out and feed that information based on pattern of growth, where the growth happens and then distribute it onto our roadway and do an operational analysis. >> Kitchen: Could you speak to the concept of the HOV lanes? You know, intuitively that seems to support more people traveling in a car, for example. You know, it seems to intuitively support the transit priority. So why is that not an element? Or can you speak to that? >> I can speak to it generally. So HOV was an early alternative at the very early screening process. It was screened out because it didn't meet some of the elements, particularly reliable and full -- there are two elements, making sure that we increase capacity and get -- made maximum use of the facility and also to, you know, get -- well, let me talk a little about HOVs themselves. What we've found in our research, as we have looked at the various elements, is many communities -- and we can -- I want to say there's 20 something at this point -- have converted HOVs into either hot tolls or have moved them to express lanes. What they've found was when you have an HOV with two plus also overwhelmed and breaks down. When you have three plus it is

[5:05:10 PM]

underutilized. So a lot of the different communities throughout the nation have begun to use either high frequency toll, some toll element to actually manage that congestion and make maximum use of the facility while ensuring there's reliability for their transit operations. So HOV has been an option, but there's been a trend nation-wide to add a tolling element for traffic management purposes. >> Kitchen:

So am I understanding you to say that two plus in a vehicle, there's too many people that it overwhelms the lane? Is that what you're saying? >> That has been an observation of a number of agencies throughout the nation. >> Kitchen: Okay. Go ahead. No. You can go ahead. >> Gallo: I have a question. I remember hearing about an app that was a carpooling app that would help reduce toll fees in certain areas. Is that being planned for mopac? >> We are still working on that. The metropy is the app that will incentivize folks to use alternative routes, time shifting, look at other -- if we -- there's different methodologies we're working true, yes, to answer your question, we're looking at those incentive Asians to get people to time shift or maybe a week as an incentive and ways to track that and give them credits, toll credits or other incentives to get them so it's not an incentive that actually provides an incentive if there's two people carpooling together? >> Not at present. >> Gallo: Okay. >> Although I'd be happy to have our person come speak to that, but I don't believe that's part of it. >> Gallo: Okay. >> At present. >> Gallo: I'm anything we had that type of app, if that type of app was possible, then it would address the carpooling, if you didn't have an HOV lane and moved it into something else, it would still give carpooling -- >> It may be a typical solution to how you make sure there's two or more people in

[5:07:12 PM]

the car. >> Gallo: I have no idea. That's for smart people. >> This is Mario. I think he can speak to that. >> Councilmembers, good afternoon still. Mario with mobility authority. We had a car ma program we funded in cooperation with the state and federal entities. What it did, basically, it did allow for two or more people to basically, by using this application, mobile application, to be able to go on and basically ride share. So with that there was funding there to be able to cover the cost of tolls so that program was extended and ended, I believe, this past summer. We're look to go try to continue that, that program, because while ridership wasn't where we wanted it to okay, we think we could have done more outreach to maybe continue. But overall it was a good program, it was a pilot. But like I said it's something we'd like to continue. >> Gallo: It was a -- was it a pilot on a particular area? >> It was. Basically just our tolled facilities so 183a and 290 east. >> Gallo: How was it funded. >> We were able to get federal funds to do that with. >> Gallo: Are we looking at trying to get the pilot program refunded into something more permanent? >> Yes, not only are where he look to go try to get it refunded possibly by the federal government but even the fusion we have, maybe some of the discretionary revenues we have at the mobility authority to start up and continue that program. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> You're welcome. >> Kitchen: Just to clarify, so what we're talking about is a pilot where you get some financial incentive and you can use the express lanes, but you get more financial incentive if you've got more than one person in the car? Is that what you're talking about? >> Under the karma program it was a ride share, but the metropy is a little different, it's another mobile app that basically it's similar to waze that most have today where it enables you to try to find the best route to get to -- to and from your destination. The thing that's different

[5:09:13 PM]

about what we're trying to do, it's going to -- the app will know how many people is heading down a certain route. Therefore, once it sends 20 cars down a route it says the next 20 find a different route so you don't congest that one route that was at one point open. So there is some incentives that can be done, that can be utilized, not only to get people to use the app and maybe get out of the congested routes, again, to and from their destinations but as well as maybe as Justin mentioned earlier maybe if they'll delay their trip if they're able to do, that start and end of the trip, basically the start of their trip, delay that so the roads may not be as congested during your peak hours. >> Kitchen: I was just trying to

get at -- asking about variations on HOV lanes essentially is what I was asking. So, I mean, because basically -- and we can -- I can take this offline and ask more questions, but basically I'm just curious. You know, if I'm understanding correctly the basic concept behind an HOV lane is you're encouraging more than one person in a car. What I'm hearing from you a minute ago was the difficulties with that and the reasons for moving to an express lane. I'm just curious about the variations because perhaps I'm not understanding but the express lane, other than the buses using the express lane, doesn't do anything to encourage less cars, if I'm understanding correctly. It's just a cost. >> I believe that's correct. And that's - goes to the heart of the purpose and need we have on the project, was that congestion management element. >> Kitchen: We're managing it by cost, not encouraging people to take alternatives, other than the bus transit. >> Yeah. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> That's correct. >> Kitchen: All right, mm-hmm. Were there other questions? I have one last question, and that relates to the design of the alternative. I'm curious about the number

[5:11:14 PM]

of lanes that are further south. And would like to ask you to speak to the two travel lanes in each direction to 45 southwest and only one in each direction to oak hill. Then I'm curious about how that will be managed, where that comes together. >> So as a part of the design that was one of the excellent city of Austin suggestions, was to go ahead and reach out and provide that connection to 290 in that area. >> Kitchen: I guess my question is more why two from the south? >> Right. >> Kitchen: Why not just one? >> Well, based on our capacity needs and looking at that ultimate long-term need, we believed that there will be more than one lane's worth of folks, capacity needed from that direction. Bringing in 290 based on the operational analysis that we did, making those assumptions and looking at those growth patterns, we believe it's geometrically possible and it works to be able to bring those together and not have an operational barackdown at that point. >> Kitchen: So bringing the two in I think that may go back to what councilmember Garza was asking about earlier, that's based on projected growth, is that what you're saying? That you're seeing more projected growth from that area than from the oak hill area? >> That is what our data is indicating. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I think you could characterize it, we're seeing growth pretty predominantly in every direction, but we're definitely seeing a lot of growth down the mopac -- >> Kitchen: I'm curious why the two at that point. >> Right based on capacity needs it's essentially an operational issue that one would -- we could use two lanes in each direction from a capacity standpoint. >> Kitchen: Okay. Any other -- further questions? Okay. Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: We appreciate your time. Okay. Our last item is just future

[5:13:14 PM]

agenda items. And, again, I'd invite all of you to submit any items to me if there's any you want to discuss right now we can bring them up. Otherwise you can submit them to me and we'll keep them on the list. Okay? All right. Anything further? All right. I want to make a note of the fact that we are ending our meeting at 5:13 this time. I think that's probably the first time. >> Here here. >> Kitchen: Anyway, thank you very much and we are adjourned.