



Travis County Commissioners Court Agenda Request

Meeting Date: 3/27/12

Prepared By/Phone Number: 854-4603

Division Director/Manager: Randy Nicholson, AICP

Department Head: Steven M. Manilla, P.E., County Executive-TNR

Sponsoring Court Member: Commissioner Davis, Precinct One
Commissioner Gomez, Precinct Four

AGENDA LANGUAGE: Receive comments regarding the DRAFT Colorado River Corridor Plan and recommended amendments, in Precinct One and four.

BACKGROUND/SUMMARY OF REQUEST AND ATTACHMENTS:

The Commissioners Court approved an Interlocal Agreement with the City of Austin and the Lower Colorado River Authority to develop a long range comprehensive plan for the development of the Colorado River Corridor between Austin and the Travis/Bastrop County line. A DRAFT plan was completed with assistance from the planning firm Bosse Pharis Associates, Inc. Staff held a public meeting and received comments which were posted on the Travis County web page. Staff review and recommended plan amendments are noted in Exhibit one and two.

The purpose of the Corridor Plan is to coordinate regional and local planning and private sector investment to facilitate the preservation and enhancement of valuable environmental, economic, recreational, and cultural resources of the plan area over the next twenty-five to thirty years. The Corridor Plan includes objectives for improved protection of local bio-diversity, preservation and restoration of floodplains and natural areas; the creation of parks, open spaces and greenways; enhancement of corridor quality of life through the long-term restoration and reclamation of mined sites; and enhancement of mobility through capital project development and new design alternatives.

Plan implementation requires private sector and intergovernmental cooperation since multiple government entities are responsible for the various aspects of transportation, natural resource conservation, and environmental protection in the corridor. The Corridor Plan is designed to improve collaboration at the regional and local level, and to enhance the knowledge and understanding of the valuable resources of the Colorado River.

Exhibit 1: Draft Plan Public Plan Review Comments

Exhibit 2: Recommended Plan Amendments

ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES:

Planning involves a certain amount of risk-taking. When we engage in planning, we are attempting to shape the future in some desired way, but there can never be an assurance that planning will achieve what we hope it will achieve. We are continually aware of the possibility of failure. The risk elected officials take with specific planning initiatives are obvious and should not be underestimated.

IMPLEMENTATION

A single project or action rarely transforms a community. To be the best it can be, to create an identity and sense of place, the plan calls for sophisticated strategies, a call for actions and initiatives on a number of different fronts and in different geographic areas.

The plan is intended to be used as the basis for making choices. It's about where development should and should not occur, and about the types of development that are appropriate in different areas. There is little doubt, in this day and age, that we will have to be extremely creative and enterprising in identifying sources of public and private funding to implement the plan, and in coming up with innovative way for paying for proposed projects and improvements.

COURT SUPPORT and COMMITMENT

One of the most important ingredients for the corridor plan is for the community to believe that planning matters, which taking the time to try to think through and envision the kind of places we want our communities to be in the future is important, and that time spent developing plans aimed at fulfilling our aspirations is not wasted. If we are skeptical about the likelihood that projects and improvements envisioned in plans will ever be realized, we are much less likely to take planning seriously. When we don't take the plans we prepare seriously, we undermine the ability of planning to bring about positive change. An inability to believe in planning, and in the possibilities for translating plans into reality, can become a major impediment to successful planning. The plan outlines several strategies to be implemented over the next two years, strategies that are ongoing and more longer term items that may not be addressed for five years or more. It is our hope to be able to look back in twenty years and realize that something outstanding has been accomplished by this planning effort, something greater than we thought possible at the outset.

be addressed for five years or more. It is our hope to be able to look back in twenty years and realize that something outstanding has been accomplished by this planning effort, something greater than we thought possible at the outset.

CITY OF AUSTIN

City of Austin Watershed Protection Department staff provided a briefing of the draft Colorado River Corridor Plan to the Environmental Board August 17, 2011. The Board recommended the adoption of the plan. COA staff provided a briefing to the Planning Commission on October 11, 2011. The Planning Commission recommended that a briefing also be provided to the Zoning and Platting Commission, the Waterfront Advisory Board, and the Parks Board. COA staff provided a briefing to the Zoning and Platting Commission on November 1, 2011, to the Waterfront Advisory Board on November 14, 2011, and to the Parks Board on December 6, 2011. Staff provided a memo to the City Council summarizing the Colorado River Corridor Plan, and advising them of the proposed schedule for adoption by the Travis County Commissioner's Court.

THE PLAN

The Colorado River Corridor Plan (Corridor Plan) builds upon the extraordinary assets of corridor to address short, medium and long term transportation, parks, and environmental needs. The Corridor Plan integrates the civic qualities of parks and greenbelts and urbanized vibrancy throughout the corridor. It aims to create locations for future cultural destinations, introduce a mix of uses, revitalize mineral extraction areas, establish a new "eco-corridor" and transform the corridor's experience.

The Corridor Plan presents a vision that accommodates new development while protecting the character and environmental quality of the Corridor. New urban areas are sited along major highways (SH 130, SH 71, FM 973 and FM 969 nodes). This relationship is aligned with the CAMPO 2035 "activity centers" concept.

Transportation corridors in the Corridor Plan have been developed with new multi-modal mobility opportunities that currently do not exist within the corridor. Roadways that accommodate bikes lanes and sidewalks and a regional trails network are proposed to seamlessly connect throughout the area. People living and raising families within the corridor will find it an inviting place to live, work, and shop, while still moving motorists, cyclists and pedestrians throughout the corridor.

It is envisioned that transit will be fully integrated within the corridor and have connectivity to the Austin Bergstrom International Airport and the City of Austin's future Urban Rail stations. Congested roadways are planned to be improved and new connectivity created. FM 969 will become a focal "rural parkway" providing

mobility as well as highlighting the visual character of the Colorado River Corridor. Arterials that front along greenways will take advantage of the rural character that defines the corridor. New connectivity is also highlighted in the Concept Plan, especially from residential areas east of SH 130. For example, new connections from Austin's Colony to FM 973 are planned as well as a new regional arterial that crosses the Colorado River connecting FM 969 with SH 71.

The envisioned corridor-wide parks and greenway system – centered on the Colorado River, Onion Creek, Gilleland Creek, and other smaller creeks – weaves together developed and undeveloped lands. The intent is to provide the growing population of the corridor with opportunities to enjoy recreational and natural resources close to where they live and to mitigate the environmental impacts of increased impervious cover in watersheds. Recreational facilities will be built at destination parks; boat ramps will be constructed at FM 973 and SH 130 river crossings and at the confluence of Onion Creek with the Colorado River; and long distance hike and bike trails will be developed along the length of the linear greenways. Bottomland woods, grasslands, and wetlands will serve to capture and filter stormwater, recharge ground water, and mitigate flood damage.

With these land patterns, new transportation opportunities, and corridor-wide parks and greenway system, people living and raising families within the corridor will find it an inviting place to work, live, and shop.

The foundation of the Corridor Plan is the analysis of the following key elements outlined below:

1. Land Use
2. Drinking Water and Well Water
3. Transportation
4. Water Quality and Stormwater
5. Parks and Land Conservation

1. LAND USE

The Corridor Plan evaluated over 30,000 acres and 32 Colorado River miles. The current population in the corridor approximately 10,000 with anticipated population growth over 30,000 by 2035. This is double the CAMPO 2035 projected increase of 10,000.

The most dominant land uses in the corridor are mining (resource extraction) estimated at 11,296 acres. TCAD does not list mining operations within a specific land use category; however, there are 6,549 acres of active and inactive mining operations.

The area is experiencing increased residential development. Current residential land area is 2,927 acres.

The conflict between these land uses (noise, traffic, visual impacts, etc.) is likely to continue in the near future as more residential and mining activity are planned in the corridor.

The area in around ABIA within the corridor is heavily impacted by the airport noise contour overlay. Land in this area is being actively purchased or mitigated by the City of Austin. There is a potential to work with the city to develop proper land use control in this area that increases open space and "re-brands" the front door to our city for many tourists and residents.

There is opportunity to plan the progression of land uses. Reclamation of 2,130 acres along SH 130 has been announced by TXI, known as Rio de Vida, the area is expected to have a population of 12,000 to 16,000. These new uses can be anticipated to need orderly transition to accommodate transportation, parks, and storm water facilities. Over half of the acres are proposed to be set aside for green space.

There is opportunity to reduce total greenhouse gas emissions by improving bike and pedestrian infrastructure, incentivizing the growth of the number of bicycle and pedestrian commuters, create highly walkable pedestrian-only areas, and introduce new innovative forms of public space such as community gardens, wind energy, and underpass parks.

Rio de Vida and the Water's Edge developments have potential for future City of Austin annexation.

2. DRINKING WATER and WELL WATER SUPPLY

Private wells in the corridor are numerous and the ability to quantify the quality, exact quantity and map the location of these wells has improved as part of the study.

There is an opportunity through the infrastructure planned for future development (ie., Rio De Vida, Water's Edge, Austin Colony) projects to increase the water, electric and wastewater services in the area.

The County/City/LCRA joint support for establishing baseline well water data in the corridor is underway.

There is opportunity to leverage existing grey water infrastructure to improve water efficiency measures and use of appropriate plant species in public landscapes, enable greywater reuse for landscapes.

3. TRANSPORTATION

Expanse and flood plain of Colorado River limits number of potential crossings and north/south connectivity. Flood Plain crossings drive transportation costs up. Mining lands will preclude potential of a robust roadway network, and extraction methods and material movement will mix industrial and residential traffic.

The Corridor relies heavily on two roadways, FM 969 and SH 71, for access and mobility; these same highways provide mobility to developing areas north and south of the Corridor as well as Bastrop County.

Limited public transit service is provided by Capital Area Rural Transportation Service.

CAMPO's 2035 future land use traffic modeling may have under estimated traffic demands.

Improvements are planned for FM 973 and FM 969, and additional roadway connections were approved in the 2011 Bonds for Gilbert Lane.

There is opportunity to provide major regional north/south arterial connectivity from SH 71 East to the north by providing an additional Colorado River crossing.

There is opportunity to provide a significant amount of hike, bike, and pedestrian facilities along roadways and greenways helping to reduce vehicle trips.

4. STORMWATER AND WATER QUALITY

Of the 30,500 Acres in the corridor approx. 13,000 Acres currently lie within the 2008 FEMA 100 year floodplain.

Floodplain reclamation and modification standards that "retain the integrity of in stream channel stability and ecology, protect riparian areas and minimize damage to the physical and biological characteristics of such areas" need to be considered for land in the corridor.

Water Quality Protection Zones can provide linear spaces that can be incorporated into a comprehensive trail and greenway system.

There is opportunity with the resource extraction process to provide topographic relief that presents opportunities for various micro climates that foster various plant and wildlife development.

There is opportunity for parks to capture and store water, turning them into green water treatment systems.

There is opportunity for the increases use of bioswales near transportation systems and add permanent green corridors.

5. PARKS AND LAND CONSERVATION

The Corridor Plan adds to on the county's initiative to build greenways along Onion and Gilleland creeks beginning in 2005 with voter-approved bond funds.

A funding of land acquisition in the corridor was approved in the fall bond election program.

Historically, initiatives for land conservation for non-park purposes in the corridor and Eastern Travis County have not been aggressive. The 2011 Texas State Legislature has given the county new authority to purchase conservation easements. The corridor is a candidate for the use of this conservation program.

Both the COA and Travis County are exploring improved creek protections that will strengthen opportunities for greenway systems.

The provision of an attractive physical environment, including parks for residents and visitors, as well as providing necessary services and facilities, will attract new residents and businesses to the area.

There is opportunity to develop resiliency plans for the plant and animal life within parks and greenways including the introduction of wildlife corridors and drought-tolerant plants.

FISCAL IMPACT AND SOURCE OF FUNDING:

None

ATTACHMENTS/EXHIBITS:

Exhibit 1

Exhibit 2

REQUIRED AUTHORIZATIONS:

Cynthia McDonald	Financial Manager	TNR	854-4239
Steve Manilla	County Executive	TNR	854-9429

--	--	--	--

CC:

Anna Bowlin	Development Services	TNR	854-7561
Jon White	Natural Resources	TNR	854-7212
Christy Moffett	CDBG Senior Planner	HHS/VS	854-3460
Betty Voights	Executive Director	CAPCOG	916-6000

: :
0101 - Administrative -

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan
Public Comment and Staff Response
November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
	WHAT ARE THE MOST CRITICAL ISSUES OR CHALLENGES FOR THE CORRIDOR?	While participants cite transportation and natural resource-related issues and challenges most often as the most critical for the corridor there are concerns about parks and land conservation as well: participants want to preserve natural corridors as an amenity for future residents in the area, improve Austin's Colony parks, and have "24/7" access to all trails.	
110	Absorbing population growth and related development.	No Comment	
80	In my opinion, the most critical issues or challenges for the corridor have to do with water quality and quantity. Water quality in all tributary creeks and the Colorado River from Bluestein eastward to the county line is not comparable to water quality in the rest of the Travis County. It would also be very beneficial for those who depend on groundwater in the eastern county be informed of how the aquifer is recharged and how much water is in the aquifer.	Under the Ground Water Supply section of the plan is a discussion of the aquifer's recharge and the estimated annual quantity available (6000 acre-feet). Water quality is not comparable to the remainder of Travis County for physical reasons (Blackland Prairie, erosive soils in the Corridor, in contrast to rockier terrain and naturally clear streams in the Hill Country) and due to differing state regulations. For instance, discharges of wastewater are prohibited by State law and TCEQ regulations in the Barton Creek Watershed and Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone.	
78	Prioritize eliminating pollutants from wastewater treatments plants discharged into the Colorado River.	This comment matches the intent of the federal Clean Water Act, to make our nation's rivers and lakes fishable and swimmable. Since the passage of the CWA in 1972, discharges from municipal wastewater treatment facilities have steadily improved in quality, through technological advancements that have been mandated as treatment techniques to reduce pollutant loads. State monitoring data over the course of time since 1972 show that the Colorado River has greatly improved in dissolved oxygen and other measurable ways that have improved aquatic life. We can expect that requirements will continue to become more stringent and near elimination of pollutant effects to occur.	
31	Critical Issues - River access	Participants identified river access and access to and development of the City's Morrison Ranch park property as critical issues.	
32	Critical Issues - Park access for City Morrison Metro Park	This use will be discussed when more detailed park site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
33	Critical Issues - Park development for City Morrison Metro Park	This use will be discussed when more detailed park site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
	Providing for the future citizens in Central Texas places like this natural corridor that remain natural enough to provide an amenity to the region.	One goal of the CRCP is to conserve and protect natural resources -- including undeveloped, natural areas -- for future generations	
1	Lack of viable park space around Austin's Colony subdivision, especially along the Colorado River. Could the City of Austin or Travis County approach the owners of the "City of Austin Colony Park", Phase III Austin's Colony HOA and Qualico (developers of Austin's Colony RiverCreek HOA) to see if they would sell these parks to them so we can get these (2) parks maintained and improved? "City of Austin Colony Park" on your Plan map is not the correct name - these are 2 different adjacent parks owned by 2 different entities (HOAs) and there is no consistent maintenance and there is a big problem with dumping. These parks could easily be turned into real parks. This section of the river is just beautiful. Connect this park to Harold Green Rd.	Travis County and the City of Austin are committed to building a comprehensive park system in the Colorado River corridor that will connect to the Austin's Colony subdivision. Travis County is currently committed to buying land on Onion Creek, Gilleland Creek, and the Colorado River with 2005 park bond funds, and will continue to buy parkland in this area with County's Proposition 2 funds earmarked for this purpose. The City of Austin's Park label will be corrected.	*
2	Bike/Pedestrian trails should connect between activity centers including transit centers, residential areas, commercial centers, ABIA, parks.	The CRCP proposes a bike/pedestrian trail system -- including park trails -- that connects transit centers, residential areas, neighborhoods, commercial centers, and public schools. Bike/pedestrian connection to ABIA will be provided along on-road bike l	
3	Trail access should be 24/7, including park trail access.	Travis County closes parks at dark for operational and public safety reasons. Insert COA park trail policy. On-road bike and pedestrian trails and sidewalks are accessible "24/7".	
	WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE CONCEPT PLAN?	Participants cited parks and recreation-related aspects of the CRCP most often when asked what they like most about the plan. They particularly like the proposed expansion of the parks, greenways, and trail systems and improved access to the river for recreation.	
81	The things that I like best about the concept plan have to do with the goals of protecting and restoring water quality and attempting to minimize modification of the 100 year floodplain.	It is agreed that these are very important elements of the plan.	
77	Runoff/wastewater improvements	Both Travis County and City of Austin are required to implement storm water management programs to reduce pollution from runoff. Each program has specific permit requirements that regulate the discharges from industry and most forms of development. Both entities must self-regulate municipal and county operations so we do not pollute our waterways. This includes adhering to stringent requirements for sewage collection, treatment, and discharge. Further improvements in sewage management in the Corridor may require conversion from the use of private septic tank systems to a centralized wastewater collection network. This usually occurs as more density or incorporation make such networks more cost effective and feasible.	
76	Conservation objectives.	No Comment	
95	The indication that major development) will occur in the SH130 corridor.	No Comment	
96	Control of the reclamation of existing and future mining operations.	No Comment	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
97	The extensive riparian corridors.	No Comment	
4	Concentration on parks & greenways.	No Comment	
5	The trail concept that utilizes the river and stream corridors.	No Comment	
6	What I like most is amount of trails.	No Comment	
7	Proposed trail network along the river that will link others (such as the Armstrong Bike Trail.)	No Comment	
8	River access points to allow/facilitate recreational use of the river for paddlers, anglers, etc.	No Comment	
9	Allowances for undeveloped green spaces/open space.	No Comment	
10	Overall, increasing the availability of public land for recreational use.	No Comment	
11	What I like most is amount of trails. I think the critical issue is ensuring that the plan is carried out. As a long-time Austin resident I've seen many high-minded plans come and go with little relation to what real estate interests actually do.	No Comment	
12	Lack of viable park space around Austin's Colony subdivision, especially along the Colorado River. Could the City of Austin or Travis County approach the owners of the "City of Austin Colony Park", Phase III Austin's Colony HOA and Qualico (developers of Austin's Colony RiverCreek HOA) to see if they would sell these parks to them so we can get these (2) parks maintained and improved? "City of Austin Colony Park" on your Plan map is not the correct name - these are 2 different adjacent parks owned by 2 different entities (HOAs) and there is no consistent maintenance and there is a big problem with dumping. These parks could easily be turned into real parks. This section of the river is just beautiful. Connect this park to Harold Green Rd.	No Comment	
13	I would like to propose that you include, as an additional stakeholder in this plan, two (2) wheeled motorized Off Highway Vehicles (OHV's), aka: motorcycles.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
14	The City Park (Emma Long) Motorcycle trails are currently the only public trails in the Austin area in which motorcycle enthusiasts and their families are allowed to enjoy their sport. The motorcyclists that use these trails have shared the trails with mountain bikers and endangered bird species successfully for many years.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
15	Many motorcyclists who participate in their sport, do so with their families (Including myself). The City Park Motorcycle trails can be very challenging (almost impossible) to some of the younger riders and those just starting off in the sport and the park is very small.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
16	I would like to propose that the reclaimed mining areas, as well as some of the wooded areas, be included in the Colorado River Corridor Plan for motorcycle enthusiast families to enjoy their sport.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
17	The inclusion of two wheeled motorized OHV's in the Colorado River Corridor Plan would provide additional public trails in the Austin area for motorcyclists of all skill levels and their families to enjoy their sport.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
18	If provided with this opportunity, the off-road motorcycle community would provide volunteer hours to build and maintain these trails and general riding areas as they do for the Emma Long trail park.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
19	I would like to suggest that you open part of the reclaimed areas of the Colorado River Corridor to off-road motorcycles. Riding areas in the Austin area are limited, and a new one would bring not only locals, but also riders from up to 2 hours away. Much of the trail creation could be done by volunteers, and you could look to places like the Sam Houston National Forest or the local Emma Long City park trails for maintenance ideas.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
20	I would like to propose that you include, as an additional stakeholder in this plan, two (2) wheeled motorized Off Highway Vehicles (OHV's), aka: motorcycles.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
26	Concept Plan shows existing trail on County land adjacent to the jail. Is there a trail there?	<u>There isn't an existing trail on the Travis County jail property. This is a "Proposed Trail". The concept plan will be corrected.</u>	*
27	Trail for cyclists in populated areas should be 10—12' wide with separate paths for pedestrians.	Travis County and the City currently don't build single-use trails because of the extra cost of building multiple trails. Design standards for new primary trails in County greenway parks are 12' wide.	
28	Germany has wells along bicycle paths with shallow pools of water where cyclists can cool off.	To specific a use for the Concept Plan. This use will be discussed when more detailed site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
30.00	What are some of your concerns?	Participants' concerns are varied and listed below.	
30.10	Concept Plan shows existing trail on County land adjacent to the jail. Is there a trail there?	Duplicates #26	
30.20	Bikers need to be separated from hikers	Travis County builds separate single-track primitive trails for hikers.	
30.30	Prohibit dogs	Travis County allows leashed dogs in its parks.	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
30.40	High speed jet boats (+60 mph) are a problem; limit to specified zones	The Texas Water Safety Act prohibits local governments from establishing "speed limits" on public waterways. Regarding limits on size or horsepower, LCRA does not discriminate on the boat itself but we do hold the boat operator responsible for their behavior. Section 31.094 of the Water Safety Act prohibits reckless or negligent operation of a boat and Section 31.095 prohibits excessive speed, which includes that no person may operate a boat at a speed greater than is reasonable and prudent, having due regard for the conditions and hazards, actual and potential, then existing, including weather and density of traffic, or greater than will permit him, in the exercise of reasonable care, to bring the boat to a stop within the assured clear distance ahead. Both of these laws are class B misdemeanors. If violations of these laws are observed, recommend calling the LCRA Ranger Dispatch at 866-527-2267.	
30.50	Eliminate juniper; protect woodlands and grasslands	It is Travis County and City policy to preserve and restore woodlands, grasslands, prairies, and riparian areas in the natural areas of their parks, which may include the removal of ashes juniper.	
30.60	Preserve large natural areas (5,000 acres) to meet TPWD ecosystem standards – maybe funding is available	The CRCP proposes preserving about 6,000 acres (approximately 20% of the corridor) as park and natural areas.	
30.70	How much of the 30,000 acres in the corridor dedicated to parks, open space	See comment above.	
30.80	How will trails be built on privately owned land such as properties on the river in the Imperial Valley area?	Right-of-Ways will be acquired from land owners	
30.90	Would like to have access to Morrison Ranch for hiking from the nearby Texas Rivers School's nearby camp.	This use will be discussed when more detailed park site plans are developed. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
30.10	How will the City handle putting trails in the water quality protection zones?	Trails are an allowed use in the Critical Water Quality Zone.	
34	Like Most - More parkland and future river access	No comment	
35	What would you Change - Concern about multi-use trails and conflicts between bikes and dogs. Separate Trails?	Travis County (and COA?) currently doesn't (don't) build single-use trails because of the extra cost of building multiple trails.	
36	What would you Change - Horse power limit on river for jet boats	The Texas Water Safety Act prohibits local governments from establishing "speed limits" on public waterways. Regarding limits on size or horsepower, LCRA does not discriminate on the boat itself but we do hold the boat operator responsible for their behavior. Section 31.094 of the Water Safety Act prohibits reckless or negligent operation of a boat and Section 31.095 prohibits excessive speed, which includes that no person may operate a boat at a speed greater than is reasonable and prudent, having due regard for the conditions and hazards, actual and potential, then existing, including weather and density of traffic, or greater than will permit him, in the exercise of reasonable care, to bring the boat to a stop within the assured clear distance ahead. Both of these laws are class B misdemeanors. If violations of these laws are observed, recommend calling the LCRA Ranger Dispatch at 866-527-2267.	
37	What would you Change - Limit for black bass fishing to maintain fish population	The Texas Parks and Wildlife Dept regulates fishing and set s limits.	
38	What would you Change - Would like to see greenway connection down through Bastrop County	No comment	
98	What would you Change-Move commerce to where existing homes, NOT TXI land where no homes exist.	The Plan shows an area of Urban Intensity at Hunters Bend and FM 969.	
99	(You have forgotten) Wildlife studies.	Staff consulted previous studies on the issue including Discovering the Colorado A Vision for the Austin Bastrop River Corridor. Link: http://ci.austin.tx.us/water/downloads/coloradofinal2.pdf	
39	What would you Change - Would like woodland and grassland restoration (hardwood)	It is Travis County and City policy to preserve and restore woodlands, grasslands, prairies, and riparian areas in the natural areas of their parks.	
40	While meandering trails are appreciated, there is also benefit from direct trails including one that minimizes the distance from US 183 to Webberville County park.	FM 969 between US 183 and Webberville is planned to include a 12' multi-use trail and sidewalk that will provide direct access between these two points.	
41	(add) Sidewalks – Webberville, Hunter's Bend	New collector or arterial roadways are to be designed and constructed with bike lanes and sidewalks or a multi-use trail. A sidewalk project is being planned for Hunters Bend Road from Austin's Colony Blvd. to Red Tails Drive.	
42	I would like to see this plan include as much transit options as possible. Do we have development nodes with mixed use planned for this area? If so, the developer should include a plan for transit options.	The CRCP envisions urban intensity nodes near Garfield and SH 71, Watersedge, Interport, Rio de Vida, along SH 71 across from ABIA, along US 183, and FM 969 west of SH 130. Amend plan to show a future transit node in Rio de Vida near SH 130 and Harold Green Blvd. Location would provide future connection to proposed City of Austin Urban Rail node at ABIA.	*
43	Problems with 18-wheelers in residential areas. Please include in the plan a way to address 18-wheelers in neighborhoods.	Currently truck traffic in the area is restricted to Dunlap Road since there are "no through truck" restrictions on Hunters Bend Road between Dunlap Road and Austin's Colony Blvd. If trucks are using other roadways in the Austin Colony subdivision, contact Danthia Joyce at the Travis County Sheriff's Office (854-9776) and report the location and type of truck.	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
44	Lack of public transportation from unincorporated areas into Austin.	Currently, the area of the Corridor outside the incorporated limits of the City of Austin is not served by Capital Metro. This area is served by the Capital Area Rural Transit Service (CARTS) and provides transportation services for persons living within the Corridor. Capital Metro is supported by a 1% sales tax, levied in the communities it serves. Membership in the Authority must be approved by voters within each jurisdiction.	
45	Additional bike/pedestrian (and service) bridges should be considered over the river (away from other major bridges, e.g. SH130, US 183, Caldwell Lane.)	Separate crossings for different modes would not be cost effective. Due to the expansive size of the floodplain and the costs associated with construction, selected areas have been identified to cross that incorporate the appropriate travel modes.	
46	New arterials should include on-street and/or off-street (i.e. trail) bike and pedestrian facilities.	Cross Sections for arterials and collectors have been developed for the Colorado River Corridor. See Appendix D: Concept Plan Models.	
47	If Caldwell lane is built across the river it should have an adjacent off-street trail that serves bike/pedestrian traffic.	Having a separate structure for bike/pedestrian traffic would not be cost effective. The structure will use current AASHTO standards.	
48	Direct roadway connections from currently populated area of Austin's Colony to FM973 and to HWY 71 (Gilbert Extension just feeds back into FM969 and doesn't really address the current problems).	A goal of the CRCP is to provide for additional opportunities or alternatives to single occupant vehicles. Envisioned are modes that include a network of pedestrian and bike trails, transit and roadway improvements. Improvements in connectivity lead to the main arterials (SH 71, FM 969 and FM 973) serving the Corridor. Future added capacity improvements to these main arterials coupled with other travel opportunities will help reduce congestion within the Corridor.	
49	Problems with 18-wheelers in residential areas. Please include in the plan a way to address 18-wheelers in neighborhoods.	Duplicate #43	
50	Lack of public transportation from unincorporated areas into Austin.	Duplicate #44	
51	Page 27 contradicts itself – it says how a much larger percentage of lower income expenses go to transportation, leaving less for food, housing, etc, then proposes to raise gas tax and vehicle registration!	The Corridor has limited options for commuting. A goal of the plan is to provide for additional opportunities other than single occupant vehicles that may be more cost effective for families with limited incomes.	
52	Page 27 - Inadequate Road Capacity Truck traffic from the mining project exacerbates the inadequate road capacity. This negatively affects local residents and commuters by contributing to traffic congestion and extended travel times.	<u>Include as bullet under Inadequate Road Capacity in Existing Conditions. Also, comment forwarded to Traffic Safety Division of TNR. The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.</u>	*
53	Page 27 -Safety It must be stressed that truck traffic is dangerous for local resident and commuter traffic on rural roads. The mining activity will contribute to and increase dangerous traffic for local residents and commuters. **Please note: I have reviewed the "open space acquisition and development agreement" which addresses the two concerns stated above. However, I have additional issues with the aforementioned agreement that I will not address at this time.	<u>Page 27, Under Safety, recommend revision to "The mix of local traffic, commuting traffic and truck traffic is another major challenge within the Corridor."</u>	*
54	Page 27 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Existing Conditions Bicycle and pedestrian modes are currently very limited. The plan points out that the area's current and forecast conditions allow for bicycle and pedestrian modes as viable means for transportation. The effects of mining however may contradict the viability for modes which expose the commuter to the threat of truck traffic and harmful air quality.	Providing for alternative modes allows for more choice in how residents can travel. Off-road, multi-use trails that accommodate bicycles as well as pedestrians and are separated from traffic by buffers are being planned for roadways within the Corridor. See Appendix D: Concept Plan Models.	
55	Page 28 - Transportation Funding Constraints New Section-Effect of Mining Project Increased traffic is a result of the mining project's use of trucks for transporting materials and employees. Additional roadways and roadway maintenance is necessary to accommodate the traffic increase. The mining project creates an increased burden on transportation investments and scarce funding resources.	Increase in traffic are cumulative and not tied to one specific use in the area.	
56	New Section-Strain on Resident and Commuter Economic Resources In order to fund the transportation projects, the plan proposes a few strategies which include raising the gas tax, including a local options sales tax, a vehicle miles traveled fee in lieu of a fuel tax increase, and toll roads. All of these options affect local residents and commuters by creating a strain on their economic resources.	As new funding options are being discussed, financial impacts on users will need to be considered. By providing for more travel opportunities and the development of mixed use center or nodes where Corridor residents can live and work, commute trips may be lessened thereby decreasing the percentage of income needed for transportation.	
57	SH 130 ROW has space reserved for a trail. Consider best location for the trail – in the ROW or adjacent to pavement?	<u>The CRCP Concept Plan accommodates a trail along SH 130 through a portion of the Corridor. Recommend amending the Plan to show the SH 130 trail extending to SH 71 East.</u>	*
58	Interested in the off-site trails system, like the connectivity. Do the all roads have bike and pedestrian facilities?	See Appendix D: Concept Plan Models. Arterial and collector roadways have accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians.	
59	Will not vote for the upcoming Travis County Bond due to the Austin Colony Secondary access project. Will actively be seeking others to vote no on Proposition One. Thinks that it has been represented that all home owner associations are supportive of the project.	Current alignment of the project is conceptual. After receiving funding for the project, Travis County staff will be working area residents to analyze future alignments of the project.	
60	Homeowner associations south of Hunters Bend Road are not supportive of project	Current alignment of the project is conceptual. After receiving funding for the project, Travis County staff will be working area residents to analyze future alignments of the project.	
61	Do not think there is a need for project, planned improvements of providing left turn lanes onto FM 969 will ease traffic problems.	Current alignment of the project is conceptual. After receiving funding for the project, Travis County staff will be working area residents to analyze future alignments of the project.	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
62	Will cause speeding along Austin Colony Blvd. south of the proposed project.	Current alignment of the project is conceptual. After receiving funding for the project, Travis County staff will be working area residents to analyze future alignments of the project.	
63	School district now allows school traffic to access school during morning and afternoon drop-offs.	Information will be incorporated into the analysis of the project's design.	
64	Can the bond project be revised to provide connectivity to FM 973, possibly at Harold Green Blvd?	Current alignment of the project is conceptual. After receiving funding for the project, Travis County staff will be working area residents to analyze future alignments of the project. However, connectivity to Harold Green Blvd. would require additional funding that has not been identified in the current Bond program.	
65	Are there truck restrictions along Hunters bend Road? Followed a truck from FM 969, along Hunters Bend Road and onto Dunlap Road that went down to the river that was carrying concrete pipe.	Currently truck traffic in the area is restricted to Dunlap Road since there are "no through truck" restrictions on Hunters Bend Road between Dunlap Road and Austin's Colony Blvd. If trucks are using other roadways in the Austin Colony subdivision, contact Danthia Joyce at the Travis County Sheriff's Office (854-9776) and report the location and type of truck.	
66	What can I do when I see a truck in the subdivision, who do I call?	Contact Danthia Joyce at the Travis County Sheriff's Office (854-9776) and report the location and type of truck.	
67	What is the timeframe of constructing the road that crosses the Colorado River?	The crossing of the Colorado River will be Burleson Manor Road is currently included in the CAMPO 2035 long range transportation plan. The road is planned to be a 2-lane minor arterial and is expected to be constructed between the years 2020-2025.	
68	We need more access to the east to provide additional ways out of the subdivision, the FM 969 project will help a little, but there needs to be more routes out of Austin Colony.	Connectivity west from Austin's Colony is complicated by the limited crossing opportunities caused by SH 130. The concept plan shows additional routes that connect to FM 973 via Harold Green Blvd. and crossing under the SH 130 bridge at the Colorado River.	
69	I heard there is going to be a connection to the airport at Rio de Vida, where will it be located?	<u>Amend plan to show a future transit node in Rio de Vida near SH 130 and Harold Green Blvd. Location would provide future connection to proposed City of Austin Urban Rail node at ABIA.</u>	*
70	Don't live in the Corridor, is TXDOT still planning on realigning FM 969 near Webberville?	The CRCP Concept Plan includes a conceptual re-alignment for FM 969. The project is included in the CAMPO 2035 long range transportation plan from US 183 to Webberville as a future 4-lane divided arterial. The project is expected to be constructed between the years 2026-2035. Alignments for the project will be evaluated as the project is developed.	
71	Page 26 - Natural and Man-made Barriers-Mining Pits Additional roadways are needed in the near future to accommodate the area's growing population. However, land use will be obstructed by underlying construction materials for the mining project. This does not benefit the residents of the area. It does however benefit the mining project.	No comment	
72	How to protect the Colorado River and its tributaries. Residents of Central Texas and its downstream neighbors will benefit from the water quality requirements and this should/could a beautiful destination recreation area.	The Water Quality section of the plan discusses many of the water pollution challenges this urbanizing area faces. Travis County, City of Austin, and LCRA, as well as state agencies including TCEQ, will continue to implement existing water quality protection programs. Depending on the agency, the programs include control of storm water and wastewater discharges, regulating development, and enforcing the program requirements through surveillance and compliance programs. County and city staff have implemented rule making initiatives to enhance protection of stream corridors. We continue to partner with TCEQ and others to develop and implement pollution reduction plans to address identified problems.	
73	How to preserve our riparian corridors! We need to protect our headwaters with setbacks from drainage creeks and streams of smaller areas that feed our named waterways.	Both Travis County and City of Austin are proposing to establish wider setbacks to separate development from our waterways, including setbacks to protect headwater areas susceptible to erosion when alterations are too close. Adoption of these requirements is scheduled for 2012.	
74	Direct roadway connections from currently populated area of Austin's Colony to FM973 and to HWY 71 (Gilbert Extension just feeds back into FM969 and doesn't really address the current problems).	Duplicate #48	
75	Maintaining and enhancing water quality in the face of increased development and usage.	You will note a discussion in the Surface Water Quality section of the plan that we currently have measurable degradation of water quality (as assessed by TCEQ). Addressing these priorities will be a focus of local jurisdictions, under mandates from the TCEQ and USEPA. Travis County, City of Austin, and LCRA implement programs aimed at maintaining existing water quality so our rivers and streams do not degrade to an impaired status. Enhancement of "chemical" and "biological" water quality may prove difficult without also improving the integrity of the aquatic and riparian ecosystems. That is a serious challenge in the urbanizing forecast for the Corridor. Nonetheless, this plan includes specific land conservation strategies to achieve such a goal.	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
79	Having not had the time to study the plan it would be unfair for me to comment on the quality and likes and dislikes. Having skimmed the draft, the one thing that I think may be missing is any plan to preserve any excess water passing through the Corridor by setting land aside for percolation fields or injection wells to recharge the aquifer and not lose any water that is not needed down stream. With the long term forecast or more severe drought into the foreseeable future this should be, in my mind, paramount in the corridor planning.	<u>Recommend amending p. 20 to include statement: "As a part of implementation, planners could look at the viability of projects to enhance aquifer recharge." The Colorado River Alluvial Aquifer is recharged directly from the underflow of creeks and rivers in the Corridor. The plan's land conservation goal calls for acquisition of land to allow for more natural hydrologic processes that retard water velocity, spreads out flows into natural floodplains, and therefore, results in greater recharge. It also makes sense to analyze other alternatives such as man-made recharge enhancement.</u>	*
82	I heard a speaker at the community meeting say that "efforts" had been made to create a groundwater conservation district. According to my records, these "efforts" consisted of: First Planning Session (December 19, 2000) Commissioners Court Work Session (May 7, 2001) Commissioners Court Briefings (June 10 & 12) 2001 Manor High School Public Meeting (July 26, 2001) As you can see, these "efforts" only got out of the Courthouse one time, and that was at Manor High School north of US 290. There was very little effort made to publicize the meeting (the Manor Messenger). Of the few attendees, most were farmers who were from north of 290. Since this "effort" was made 10 years ago and the area has changed a lot, perhaps it might be time to try to educate the public about a groundwater conservation district in eastern Travis County, just like is being done in western Travis County.	In Southwest Travis County, State law requires that a Groundwater Conservation District (GCD) be formed, based on State-level planning determinations. In 2005, the TCEQ evaluated whether northern Travis County (including the Corridor area north of the Colorado River) should be declared a priority groundwater management area and therefore be subject to a GCD. The TCEQ determined it was not necessary, in consideration of future water supply sources forecasted. When the State-level planners determine a priority does not exist, that leaves local options requiring a petition process and voter approval of a taxing authority. The efforts referred to by the commenter investigated the feasibility and interest in formation of a GCD. Additional efforts by Travis County staff were undertaken in 2009 to discuss the interest with each of the water suppliers who serve the eastern parts of the county. The water suppliers registered confidence in their ability to supply municipal needs through a combination of groundwater wells and interconnections from surface water or imported groundwater. Our conclusion is there is not a very strong interest in a GCD at this time.	
83	Does mining cause nitrate-nitrogen in the water?	There is no evidence that mining in the Corridor area caused nitrates to become elevated in groundwater. The Ground Water Quality section of the plan describes the likely sources.	
84	What does it mean that Hornsby Bend and COA use surface water, and the rest use groundwater? (Page 18)	The statement is meant to convey that the COA drinking water source is "primarily" from the Colorado River water storage in Lake Travis and that Hornsby Bend is supplied by diversions of water from the Colorado River. <u>A correction will be made.</u>	*
85	Is surface water more susceptible to the effects of mining than groundwater?	Both are susceptible to effects from mining. A scientific study is underway to help us better understand the cause and effect relationship between this land use and the surrounding environment.	
86	Page 18 - Isn't our water supplier Monarch now, and not Hornsby Bend?	Yes, it is our understanding that Hornsby Bend is the commonly used name for the utility but that it was owned by Southwest Water and recently was either sold or had a name change to Monarch. A correction will be made.	
87	My apologies, but after I received your acknowledgment of my prior comments, I realized that I forgot to compliment you on objective #12: "Promote more optimal locations for wastewater treatment facilities through regionalization and use of post-effluent polishing treatment units."	This is a challenging objective and the support for it is appreciated.	
88	I have heard that the City of Austin plans for east Travis County to be one of it's "desired development corridors" but so far, that seems to be expressed only as the "desired development corridor for wastewater facilities". Not only are there existing COA facilities at Walnut Creek, the "South Austin" Regional Wastewater Plant, Hornsby Bend, and Wild Horse Ranch but there are also several private wastewater facilities that discharge into Elm Creek, Gilleland Creek and Wilbarger Creek. I have read that the City of Austin has purchased land near Taylor Lane and Decker Lane for a potential wastewater plant. Also, when Austin Energy received the o.k. to build the solar energy plant at Webberville, the City retained the rights to use the remainder of the land for a potential wastewater plant. So, regionalization and post-effluent polishing" seem to be a terrific idea.	The desired development zone is the area of Austin that includes the Colorado River Corridor area where growth is encouraged, as opposed to the drinking water protection zone, where development is more restricted in an attempt to protect Austin's drinking water supply and the Edward's Aquifer. It is difficult to research and speculate on private plans for wastewater management. The TCEQ regulates wastewater discharges both for the City's regional treatment plans and also for smaller private facilities that provide service outside of Austin's CCN.	
89	A question: What utility districts have been sought or formed within the corridor area in the past 5 years?	TXI's Rio De Vida proposal includes a Municipal Utility District.	
90	Concerns regarding the recent sewage spill at So. Austin Regional WWTF. How did it happen, what was the impact, will it happen again, did it or similar mishaps result in TCEQ enforcement?	The commenter inquired on the facts surrounding a sewage discharge 8/23/2011. The COA reported an accidental leak in its chlorination system used to disinfect wastewater at the So. Austin Regional Wastewater facility. This resulted in the discharge of partially treated wastewater into the Colorado River near Falwell Lane, north of SH 71. The sewage was treated through the entire plant, except for the final step of disinfection. Approximately 300,000 gallons of treated wastewater, that was not chlorinated, was discharged. The COA immediately took corrective action to repair the chlorination system. The potential consequence of this type non-compliance is elevated bacteria/pathogens may have been present in the river, with a risk of gastro-intestinal illness for swimmers if they had been in the river downstream from this facility on that day. It is not typical for TCEQ to fine or take enforcement action against a discharger for a one-time event, if appropriate actions are taken to mitigate and correct the problem. Enforcement usually results when a pattern of recurrent or unresolved violations occur.	
91	How reasonable is it to have a strategy for green spaces and trails along creeks that traverse TXI's mining areas. It was suggested that water flowing down Elm Creek will leave the bed/banks of the creek when flow rises and flow down into the abandoned mining pits up near SH 130. Is this a good place for a public creek-side trail?	The Concept Plan vision is for a natural and appealing area in the long term horizon.	
92	Silt washes out of the McMorris property as river "pulses" with water releases. Upstream, water is clear; downstream, muddy. Big job to correct. River at Decker Creek is also muddy.	Issue is beyond scope of the Concept Plan. State and Federal agencies may be involved.	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
93	<p>This is an impressive effort which shows cooperation among Travis County, City of Austin, and the LCRA and expertise developed over years of trial. Limiting mining to a temporary use and phasing it in and out without irreparable damage to the land is impressive. As a member of the Native Prairie Association who has worked for the past 20 years in plant restoration of my own property on the Pedernales River, I would of course support limiting disturbance as much as possible. I have found that it takes some backbone to push back against development interests. They will eventually respond to equal counter force. With aggregate mining, you are now several steps away from original forested bottomland interspersed with grassland. However, Travis County's restoration efforts are impressive; Hamilton Pool Preserve is a stellar example. Few landowners can compete with your expertise. Please remember that it takes years if ever for people to identify and understand plants and value wildlife. In my experience, they tend to think in terms of exploitation and react with fear to the natural world. Take a leadership role with residents.</p>	No comment	
94	<p>Don't bend to their uninformed prejudices as some preserves feel pressured to do. As you point out, "Protecting natural systems is critical to human, plant, and animal health and well-being." I would counter urbanization wherever possible. Pollution, loss of riparian areas, exotic species are unwanted side effects. We've lost too much of one of the most magnificent landscapes in the world. With drought, we must hold the line against those who would speed our state's destruction. Alternative transportation, bicycle lanes, hiking trails, connected greenways and greenbelts, your land ethics seem irreproachable. Again, as someone who has had to fight my whole community to keep them from cutting down vegetation on Pedernales riverbanks, I say hold to the natural vision. People will come around eventually. When it comes to plants and animals, the majority is almost always wrong. Finally, the concept of wildlife corridors is important to understand. The National Wildlife Federation defines plant and wildlife corridors as "crucial habitats that provide connectivity over different time scales, including seasonal or longer, among areas used by animal and plant species." All animals and plant life benefit from these corridors as connections to vital habitat and migration patterns. Our rivers are our lifeblood. Save Texas rivers as wildlife corridors and we can save Texas! Thank you for making Austin a viable and living city of the future. Please call on me if you need public support.</p>	No comment	
100	<p>I am most concerned with the mining off of Dunlap Road/Drive. I see that the County may put in extra lanes at Dunlap that will allow TXI trucks to turn on to Dunlap for their mining operations and at taxpayer's expense. I thought this was to be at TXI's expense NOT the taxpayers! After all of Austin Colony's and neighbors protests of TXI putting in this pit next to the housing, you are going to help them? Reclamation of these pits is a joke! What's the saying, too little, too late. This is what the City of Austin (since we are in their ETJ) and the County Commissioners failed to look for! Who's to suffer from all of this mining and the trucks on FM 969? US, the residents of this area!!!! We will move before any of this happens but you are truly too little, too late!!!!</p>	<p>The proposed Tri Party agreement requires that TXI fund and reconstruct Dunlap Road to a 30' cross section which includes two 12' traffic lanes with two 3' shoulders using sufficient base, sub-base and overlay to accommodate projected truck traffic from mining operations. Additional capacity improvements would be funded in the future as increased traffic warrants. Sources of funding for those improvements have not been identified.</p>	
101	<p>Mining is incompatible with residential areas and should not be a part of the vision for the future in the Colorado River Corridor Plan.</p>	<p>Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan. Currently the County does not have the land use authority to impede legal mining uses on private property. The Plan acknowledges this major use.</p>	
102	<p>Allowing mining contradicts the basic goals stated in the Plan, such as protecting natural resources and improving quality of life.</p>	<p>Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan. Currently the County does not have the land use authority to impede legal mining uses on private property. The Plan acknowledges this major use.</p>	
103	<p>Sand and gravel mining in this area will be detrimental to the health and safety of the people in this area, and will decrease property value in an already difficult economy.</p>	<p>Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan. Currently the County does not have the land use authority to impede legal mining uses on private property. The Plan acknowledges this major use.</p>	
104	<p>According to Central Texas Green print for Growth, the TXI Hornsby Bend East and West proposed mine site is categorized as being located in the highest priority area for protection. As a resident of Travis County, I would like to see this area protected, rather than mined.</p>	<p>The passing of the November 2011 bond initiative will allow for the County to begin purchase of open space conservation easements. The limiting factors will remain: 1) available funding, 2) market values of the property, and 3) willing sellers.</p>	
105	<p>This sand and gravel operation may cause harmful dust in the air that could lead to lung problems, and also may compromise our water quality and supply amongst other things. It is an important cause to me, and I want it to be known that people are concerned about this issue.</p>	No comment	
106	<p>Webberville passed ordinance limiting the amount of time that an aggregate mining pit can be left open.</p>	<p>The County does not currently possess the authority to limit this aspect of mining.</p>	
107	<p>Page 2 - Why Prepare the Colorado River Corridor Plan? In its current form, the plan does not adequately reflect residents' concerns. Residents concerns include the effects of the mining project on health, wellness, and overall quality of life. The plan should include statements which promote an environment that maintains and improves health. In its current form, the plan includes statements that may compromise residents' health, wellness, and overall quality of life.</p>	<p>This planning process cannot undo the past practices that so many residents in the Corridor area legitimately raise as concerns. However, effective implementation of the CRCP is a vehicle to improve quality of life.</p>	
108	<p>Reclamation of mining areas. Mines are in direct contradiction to the conservation/protection objective of the plan.</p>	No comment	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
109	I think the critical issue is ensuring that the plan is carried out. As a long-time Austin resident I've seen many high-minded plans come and go with little relation to what real estate interests actually do.	No comment	
111	I really like the Plan in general.	No change.	
112	Thanks to those involved for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan. I am in general quite impressed with the thought that has gone into this plan and would support it going forward to the extent any one citizen can do so. In particular the concept of zones of land use with most rural at the river to urban distal makes great sense as does overlapping the needs for park/natural areas with those more rural zones closest to the river.	THANKS	
113	I would change the roll-out for roads and green spaces to be sooner.	A significant number of road and green space improvements are anticipated in the first five years. A typical road project may take five or more years to realize.	
114	The people who both mine sand and gravel and the developers of residential and commercial benefit from our beautiful places. Require them to help us maintain their economic future by adhering to strict requirements to include Open Space, water quality and parkland/trail corridors.	Current City and County policies, given their regulatory authority, supports this statement.	
115	Are we asking developers to and mining operations to bear the full burden of their impact on this area. For example, what are the future costs to taxpayers of managing stream water runoffs, erosion of stream banks and restoration of property formally mined?	The Corridor Plan is a vision and is limited in its ability to address this type of concern.	
116	I know TXI is a sponsor of this plan, but please consider the existing people in this corridor when making/implementing a plan - we need things now, not after Rio De Vida is built. Consider road and park placement to be nearer to and to enhance the standard of life for the majority of people who are already living in the corridor - the people of Austin's Colony.	No comment	
117	Is there a method to guarantee mining companies will meet their obligations? Some kind of bonding?	The County requires posting of fiscal (bond) for erosion control and safety berm. The bond from TXI for Hornsby Bend totals \$311,270.	
118	I really like the Plan in general.	THANKS	
119	I would change the roll-out for roads and green spaces to be sooner. Duplicates #113	Duplication #113	
120	I know TXI is a sponsor of this plan, but please consider the existing people in this corridor when making/implementing a plan - we need things now, not after Rio De Vida is built. Consider road and park placement to be nearer to and to enhance the standard of life for the majority of people who are already living in the corridor - the people of Austin's Colony. Duplicates #116	Duplication #116	
121	I would like to start by saying a big thank you for giving the public an opportunity to participate in the Colorado River Corridor Plan.	THANKS	
122	Thank you for giving the public an opportunity to participate in the Colorado River Corridor Plan.	THANKS	
123	After viewing the Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan, I must say that I see some inconsistencies between what you say you want and what you are allowing to actually happen. As someone who lives in one of the areas that will be affected by TXI's mining operations, I cannot believe that you would allow mining to occur in a residential neighborhood! It is incompatible with the lifestyle that we want and SHOULD NOT be a plan for our future. When you allow mining to occur, it contradicts several of the goals stated in your plan such as 1) Conserve and Protect Natural Resources" (p. 36) and "Goal 2: Improve Quality of Life" (p.37).	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan.	
124	If you truly want to "incorporate and reflect current public input about how local residents view their communities" as stated in the Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan on page 36, then you would not promote mining projects, as residents want to protect the health, safety, environment (including the Colorado River), history, and property value in their community.	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan.	
125	Thank you for listening to the opinions of those who live in the corridor and will be affected by the decisions you make today and tomorrow	THANKS	
126	I want to provide my perspective on the Colorado River Corridor Plan. I have lived in Austin since 1988 and am concerned that the natural resources that give us the quality of life we all enjoy is not being cared for. Specifically, I think that mining is incompatible with residential areas and should NOT be a part of the vision for the future in the Colorado River Corridor Plan.	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan.	
127	Allowing mining contradicts several of the basic goals stated in the Colorado River Corridor Draft plan, such as "Goal 1: Conserve and Protect Natural Resources" (p. 36) and "Goal 2: Improve Quality of Life" (p.37). If you want to truly "incorporate and reflect current public input about how local residents view their communities" as stated in the Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan on page 36, then you would NOT promote mining projects, as residents want to protect the health, safety, environment (including the Colorado River) and history of the community.	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan.	
128	Property value will continue to decrease if mining is allowed, and this will be detrimental to the residents and community as a whole in an already difficult economy. Sympathizing with and accepting financial contributions from a mining company unfairly compromises the rights of residents in this area and destroys the integrity of the entire Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan.	No comment	
129	(1) I think some of the critical issues here are not well covered.	Not specific enough to respond.	
130	(A) I think that a lot of the draft proposal is aimed at providing TXI a foothold on the Rio De Vida project(if this project ever takes off). If anybody is foolish enough to believe that TXI is going to have a community center in this development that will be inclusive to the entire area, I think that they are wrong. It seems to me that the part this draft plan that discusses campo plans for servicing this area are based on the city of Austin annexing this area. Is TXI planning something with the city of Austin?	The master plan of Rio De Vida currently supports expansive open space and connectivity that can tie into the vision of the Corridor Plan. There may be confusion regarding the intention of a "center" at Rio De Vida. Currently, the Corridor Plan expresses an objective to explore the logistics of relocating and consolidating the two proposed CAMPO 2035 "Intermodal Centers" to Harold Green Road and SH 130. The City has no plans to annex Rio De Vida at this time.	
131	The proposed site for Rio De Vida, according to your draft plan will still be mined for 5 more years, yet in the latter part of the same plan you discuss starting the Rio De Vida project in less than 2 years.	Development of Rio De Vida may indeed begin on portions of the TXI site prior to the entire site being closed for mining. The discussed timing of such is taken into consideration by the Plan.	
132	Is Austin going to annex this area? When? If so, how would it change the draft plan?	The City has no plans to annex the large extent of Corridor area at this time.	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
133	I feel mining is incompatible with residential areas and should not be a part of the vision for the future in the Colorado River Corridor Plan. Allowing mining contradicts the basic goals stated in the Plan, such as protecting natural resources and improving quality of life. Sand and gravel mining in this area will be detrimental to the health and safety of the people in this area, and will decrease property value in an already difficult economy. According to Central Texas Greenprint for Growth, the TXI Hornsby Bend East and West proposed mine site is categorized as being located in the highest priority area for protection. As a resident of Travis County, I would like to see this area protected, rather than mined.	No comment	
134	I really don't understand why the Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan is sympathetic to mining, and even seems to promote it. Are corporate interests more important to the City, County and LCRA than the people? Isn't it your job to protect our lives and our futures? I live in Chaparral Crossing and will be surrounded on 2 sides by this mining. You are putting corporate interests before the health and safety of residents. Dust inhalation is dangerous and can cause permanent lung damage. Our water quality and quantity may be endangered. This is not right, and I can't believe this plan for our bright future includes mining in residential areas. Honestly, I think this entire plan needs to be done again, because I think the financial investment from TXI has blinded you to the rights of the people, and you are not only taking away their voice, but are endangering their lives and their health. We who live in this area have the right to have a say in what happens in our own community. I would like to know exactly how you are going to process and incorporate the comments that are being sent to you into the Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan. Is there any way I can find out more about that?	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. It is intended to help guide future regulatory decisions in the Corridor area.	
135	Page 36 - Mining contradicts all goals presented in this section	No comment	
136	Page 42 -Is there really any guarantee on Reclamation? How do we know this will really happen?	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan.	
137	How can you plan parks and greenbelts when you don't really know what the effects of mining will be on the landscape, water and waterways of the area?	There are a handful of mandatory buffers and setbacks from drainages and waterway features that mines must consider.	
138	Page 52 - Says CAMPO center will be located in Rio de Vida. Rio de Vida doesn't exist, and there is no way of knowing if it will be built in the first place. How can you predict how many people will reside there when it doesn't even exist yet? I think this Plan again is giving something to TXI that would better serve the people elsewhere. Why is this being given to TXI by way of Rio de Vida? Right down the street, there is a huge concentration of people RIGHT NOW in Austin's Colony, Forest Bluff, Chaparral Crossing and more, and this area continues to grow. I think that this area would be a much more appropriate place for a transportation hub.	The master plan of Rio De Vida currently supports expansive open space and connectivity that can tie into the vision of the Corridor Plan. Currently, the Corridor Plan expresses an objective to explore the logistics of relocating and consolidating the two proposed CAMPO 2035 "Intermodal Centers" to Harold Green Road and SH 130.	
139	Mining is incompatible with residential areas and should not be a part of the vision for the future in the Colorado River Corridor Plan	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan.	
140	If you want to truly "Incorporate and reflect current public input about how local residents view their communities" as stated in the Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan on page 36, then you would not promote mining projects, as residents want to protect the health, safety, environment (including the Colorado River) and history of the community.	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan.	
141	Sympathizing with and accepting financial contributions from a mining company unfairly compromises the rights of residents in this area and destroys the integrity of the entire Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan	The Corridor Plan is only a vision and not intended as a regulatory mechanism. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25 years scope of the Corridor Plan.	
142	Sand and gravel mining in this area will be detrimental to the health and safety of the people in this area, and will decrease property value in an already difficult economy. Duplicates #103	Duplicates #103	
143	According to Central Texas Green-print for Growth, the TXI Hornsby Bend East and West proposed mine site is categorized as being located in the highest priority area for protection. As a resident of Travis County and Chaparral Crossing, I would like to see this area protected, rather than mined. Duplicates #104	Duplicates #104	
144	Thank you for taking my comments into consideration. I would love to hear back from you with any answers/responses to my questions, and again, I am curious to know what the process will be to incorporate our comments into the Plan.	Comments received by the deadline are responded to by the planning team and included as an appendix to the Corridor Plan document. Additionally, the same information may be found on the project website at the following URL: http://www.co.travis.tx.us/tnr/CRCP	
145	I am VERY supportive of your attempt to be pro-active in planning for this area.	No change.	
146	Although it is not technically within your study area boundary, I ask that you include consideration of the City of Austin's 2500+ acre 'Webberville Tract'. It is located just north of 969, and the city's development on the site will have a dramatic impact on the Colorado River corridor. We need to be certain that the City of Austin's development on its site is appropriate, not destructive.	For this particular planning exercise, the northern limit is the southern boundary of FM 969. It is understood that the Webberville Tract may have overlapping effects within the Corridor Plan area, but the focus of this plan is centered along the Colorado River and easily discernable boundaries.	
147	Your plans mention adding another north-south arterial crossing the river, and show extension of Burleson Manor Rd. as a possible route. Wouldn't it make more sense to extend Taylor Lane southward as the river crossing? Extension of Burleson-Manor will NOT provide a complete connection from 71 to 290; an advantage of Taylor/Kimbrow is that it WILL provide a complete connection between 71 and 290.	The Burleson /Manor Road extension provides for connectivity between SH 71 E and US 290. The crossing also takes advantage of crossing at a narrow section of the Colorado River's 100 year flood plain. The Taylor Lane crossing has extensive 100 year flood plain near the intersection with FM 969 causing the Burleson/Manor Road to be more economically viable.	
148	As a general comment, although I assume you're already doing this: Please be certain that you are coordinating with other planning, such as the proposed new standards to require adequate water supply for new development. I reading your 'River Corridor' material again this morning I was struck by how much of it was relevant to citizen's concerns expressed at last evening's meeting about water supply regulations.	No comment	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
149	The Colorado River Corridor Draft Plan is really disturbing. I hope you will reconsider. I live in east Austin and I don't think mining anywhere close to Austin is a reasonable idea. It will affect the value of homes in the area and is likely a health hazard.	No comment	
150	I am writing to convey my concern over the Colorado River Corridor Plan, namely the mining that is proposed to take place. I feel that this would be a grave error at best, and an extremely harmful, discriminatory action at worst. Given that there are neighborhoods nearby, it would be disastrous to introduce a mining operation into the area, which would undoubtedly negatively affect home values in an already extremely tenuous housing market recession, especially since this recession was so closely tied with falling home values. To actually bring about these declining values to a neighborhood through a conscious effort is simply reprehensible.	No comment	
151	From there, in addition to destroying local property values, it would certainly threaten quality of life (contradicting the Colorado River Corridor Draft Goal #2, "Improve Quality of Life") and would have undoubted harmful effects on the local environment (in contradiction with Goal #1, "Conserve and Protect Natural Resources." Indeed, there is no way to move forward with mining in the area and preserve either quality of life or the environment; the only thing protected in that scenario would be the incomes of special interests.	No comment	
152	Generally speaking, I believe it bodes extremely poorly that this idea was even considered in a neighborhood where families live. I will also go so far as to say that this would never happen in high income neighborhoods like central or west Austin; at the very least, the residents would have been given more of a say, more information, and more input onto the plan. The fact that this was not the case in this neighborhood makes the Planning Team seem solely money driven at best and discriminatory at worst. I hope you will take this into consideration moving forward, keeping in your awareness the lives you are affecting through this decision, and choose not to allow mining in this area.	Harvest of natural resources have be a mainstay in the Corridor since early settlement. Large-scale residential subdivisions are a relatively new land use. Current conditions are Mining 21.4% and Residential 9.6% of the Corridor. Sand and gravel mining will be a continued reality during the 25-year scope of the Corridor Plan.	
153	Page 8 - Residential Development Versus Aggregate Mining Resident concerns should be given a greater voice in the considered plans to "reduce truck traffic, mitigate visual impacts and establish baseline environmental monitoring conditions against which planners can evaluate future impacts".	The Planning Team encourages you to stay involved with all aspects of infrastructure planning within the Corridor area.	
154	I think that it is unlikely that "desired development" will occur when there are so many wastewater plants. I live on FM 969 near Gillelland Creek and on evenings when there is very little wind from the southeast, we can smell "effluent". We are unsure whether it is the "South Austin" plant or if Magna Flow has found another farm in the area to discharge "beneficial remediation".	No comment	
155	Can a copy of the TXI plans for reclamation of the Hornsby mine sites be posted for public review?	Final plans are not on file. Permit requires County to review and approval the final reclamation plan, after mining has occurred and before TXI closes out and leaves the sites. Preliminary information on Permit No. 11-2430 and 11-2431 can be viewed at TNR Central Files office 13th and San Antonio via Open Records Request. This can be filed online: http://www.co.travis.tx.us/tnr/pdffiles/open_records_request.pdf ; filed via email to: Open.Records@co.travis.tx.us ; or requested by telephone at 854-7683.	
156	Can we (the planning entities) offer to distribute paper copies of the plan for a cost? A handful of participants were interested in buying a copy.	The plan will be available for download on the project website at the following URL: http://www.co.travis.tx.us/tnr/CRCP	
157	Does not think there should be a Center identified at Rio de Vida, why were the Centers combined and move to the Rio de Vida location? Does moving the Center provide economic incentives to the developers of TXI? Believes Travis County staff is working with TXI to incent development at Rio de Vida at the expense of development occurring east of Rio de Vida.	The master plan of Rio De Vida currently supports expansive open space and connectivity that can tie into the vision of the Corridor Plan. Currently, the Corridor Plan expresses an objective to explore the logistics of relocating and consolidating the two proposed CAMPO 2035 "Intermodal Centers" to Harold Green Road and SH 130.	
158	By designating Rio de Vida as a Center and allowing mining to continue next to the Austin Colony subdivision, property values are being lowered and transferred to property owned by TXI.	No comment	
159	Believes that the Center would be more representative of placement at Austin Colony subdivision since growth is occurring at this location. How was it identified at Rio De Vida can it be moved there?	The master plan of Rio De Vida currently supports expansive open space and connectivity that can tie into the vision of the Corridor Plan. Currently, the Corridor Plan expresses an objective to explore the logistics of relocating and consolidating the two proposed CAMPO 2035 "Intermodal Centers" to Harold Green Road and SH 130. The consideration would involve assessment of the adverse impacts to natural resources and suitability of infrastructure.	
160	I really like the Plan in general.	THANKS	
161	Like: Providing for the future citizens in Central Texas places like this natural corridor that remain natural enough to provide an amenity to the region.	No comment	
162	Austin's Colony Phase V, Section 3 approved unrecorded Final Plat is not shown on the Concept Plan. Our concern is the Concept Plan has a rural arterial roadway running through the Plat without taking into account the approvals currently in place...	Amend Concept Plan to show the approved unrecorded final plat for Austin's Colony Phase V Section 3. A future rural arterial (Deaf Smith Blvd.) is aligned through this plat. Travis County will be required to negotiate with the owner to amend the unrecorded final plat to accommodate the alignment of the future arterial.	*
163	Austin's Colony Phase 6-14, approved unrecorded Preliminary Plat is not shown on the Concept Plan. Our concern is..... the Concept Plan has a rural arterial roadway running through the Plat without taking into account the approvals currently in place...	Amend Concept Plan to show Future Arterial C as a Rural Arterial (light blue). Amend Concept Plan to show future Arterial C north of Hunters Bend Road offset from Arterial C south of Hunters Bend Road. Alignment of Arterial C south of Hunters Bend Road remains as shown on Concept Plan. Amend Arterial C north of Hunters Bend Road to follow existing Hallday Avenue and extend northward to terminus at FM 969. Travis County will be required to negotiate with the owner Austin's Colony Phases 6A and 6B to accommodate the future alignment of Arterial C north of Hunters Bend Road.	*
164	Chaparral Crossing has approved site plan is accurately reflected on the base map.	No comment	

EXHIBIT 1 Colorado River Corridor Plan

Public Comment and Staff Response

November 28, 2010

#	Public Comment	Staff Comment	Amend
165	A proposed Neighborhood Collector running north and south to FM 969 from the proposed westward extension of Dunlap Rd S. runs through and adjacent existing subdivisions and various platted properties (Austin's Colony Sec 6B, 7B and Chaparral Crossing). While we are in support of the need for this collector, it is our responsibility to point out that it will affect previously approve plans, plats, and site plans.	See comment for #163.	*
166	The Plan reflects a proposed Rural Arterial from Dunlap Rd S. running west through the approved preliminary plan for Austin's Colony Phases 6-13. We are requesting that the alignment be adjusted per the preliminary plan. Further this same Rural Arterial affects the Austin's Colony Phase V, Sec 3.	Amend Concept Plan to show the approved preliminary plat for Austin's Colony Phases 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Amend alignment of Deaf Smith Blvd to reflect alignment in Austin's Colony Phases 9, 10, 11 and 12. Amend Concept Plan to terminate Deaf Smith Blvd. at future Arterial C. Delete section of Deaf Smith Blvd. from Future Arterial C to Dunlap Rd. North. Se comment for #162 for alignment through Austin's Colony Phase V Section 3.	*
167	At the Town Hall meeting on 9/22 ...there was no discussion of the extension of Westall St past Hound Dog Trail. We question the need for this extension as it runs near and parallel to the Austin's Colony Secondary Access Rd to Gilbert Lane. This roadway is included in the 2011 Travis County Bond Election.	Amend Concept Plan to show current alignment of Austin Colony Secondary Access project that was included in 2011 voter approved bond election. Amend extension of Sandifer Street to parallel Elm Creek flood plain. A roadway parallel to the floodplain visually integrates the greenspace into the neighborhood and puts more eyes on the greenway users which improve safety. Also, amend roadway classification of future Sandifer Street extension from Minor Arterial to Neighborhood Collector (green). With limited options for east/west connectivity to FM 973 and expected high volumes of traffic connecting to work destinations in the Urban Core, Transportation and Natural Resources staff have identified the need to study the use of roundabouts as a traffic safety measure to calm traffic. As plans develop for Rio de Vida, future collector level intersections would offer an opportunity apply this traffic calming technique especially for collector intersections west of Austin's Colony subdivision.	*
168	The approved TXI Site Plans for Hornsby Bend West and Hornsby Bend East are not reflected on the Concept Plan. We feel strongly that both projects should be reflected in the Concept Plan as they have been approved.	No change recommended. The plan reflects the long range vision. TXI plans are short term uses.	
169	In the body of the CRCP there is a section titled Existing Transportation System (p. 22) which contains a map labeled Development. This map shows Subdivisions, Preliminary Plats and Emerging Developments. It would be useful addition to the Concept Plan to have this information included on the base map so that proposed roadways are reflected per previous approvals.	Recommend change. Agree the Concept Plan should reflect the proposed land use intensity shown on page 22.	*
170	Bill Carson with Native Texas Nursery submitted a letter to Judge Biscoe noting concerns with mining's impact on ground water their agricultural wells.	The County, City, and LCRA are jointly funding the monitoring of nearby wells.	

EXHIBIT 2
Colorado Rivers Corridor Plan
January 10, 2012

RECOMMENDED DRAFT PLAN AMENDMENTS

Plan Narrative

1. Page 18.
2. Page 20. Under Opportunities include statement: As a part of implementation, planners could look at the viability of projects to enhance aquifer recharge.
3. Page 27. Under Inadequate Road Capacity add bullet: Truck traffic from the mining project exacerbates the inadequate road capacity. This negatively affects local residents and commuters by contributing to traffic congestion and extended travel times.
4. Page 27. Under Safety, revise sentence: The mix of local traffic, commuting traffic and through truck traffic along FM 969 is another major challenge within the Corridor.
5. Page 47 Parks and Greenways Objective, change strategy: Provide opportunities for the community to vote for funding of land acquisition of critical lands along the river” to 5-15 time frame. Voters approve an initial level of funding in November 2011.
6. Page 51. Mobility Objective, delete safety strategy: ~~Construct two left turn lanes at Hunters Bend Road to FM 969. Work has been completed by TXDOT.~~
7. Page 51 Mobility Objective , delete safety strategy: ~~Seek funding to provide alternative collector access to Hornsby-Dunlap Elementary School and Dailey Middle School Approved by voters in November 2011.~~
8. Page 53. Bicycles/Ped Objective delete strategy: ~~Seek funding to complete sidewalk gap along Hunters Bend Road from Austin Colony to Red Tails. Approved by voters in November 2011.~~

Concept Map

1. Remove pathway shown adjacent to the Travis County Jail.
2. Add a future pathway along SH 130 to connect to SH 71 East.
3. Add a future transit node at Harold Green Rd and SH 130.
4. Correct label location for City of Austin's Colony Park.
5. Page 22. In the body of the CRCP there is a section titled Existing Transportation System (p. 22) which contains a map labeled Development. This map shows Subdivisions, Preliminary Plats and Emerging Developments. The Concept Plan should reflect the proposed land use intensity shown on page 22.
6. Amend Concept Plan to show the approved unrecorded final plat for Austin's Colony Phase V Section 3. A future rural arterial (Deaf Smith Blvd.) is aligned through this plat. Travis County will be required to negotiate with the owner to amend the unrecorded final plat to accommodate the alignment of the future arterial.
7. Amend Concept Plan to show Future Arterial C as a Rural Arterial (light blue). Amend Concept Plan to show future Arterial C north of Hunters Bend Road offset from Arterial C south of Hunters Bend Road. Alignment of Arterial C south of Hunters Bend Road remains as shown on Concept Plan. Amend Arterial C north of Hunters Bend Road to follow existing Hallday Avenue and extend northward to terminus at FM 969. Travis County will be required to negotiate with the owner Austin's Colony Phases 6A and 6B to accommodate the future alignment of Arterial C north of Hunters Bend Road.
8. Amend Concept Plan to show the approved preliminary plat for Austin's Colony Phases 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Amend alignment of Deaf Smith Blvd to reflect alignment in Austin's Colony Phases 9, 10, 11 and 12. Amend Concept Plan to terminate Deaf Smith Blvd. at future Arterial C. Delete section of Deaf Smith Blvd. from Future Arterial C to Dunlap Rd. North. See comment for #162 for alignment through Austin's Colony Phase V Section 3.

EXHIBIT 2

Colorado Rivers Corridor Plan

January 10, 2012

9. Amend Concept Plan to show current alignment of Austin Colony Secondary Access project that was included in 2011 voter approved bond election. Amend extension of Sandifer Street to parallel Elm Creek flood plain. A roadway parallel to the floodplain visually integrates the greenspace into the neighborhood and puts more eyes on the greenway users which improve safety. Also, amend roadway classification of future Sandifer Street extension from Minor Arterial to Neighborhood Collector (green).

With limited options for east/west connectivity to FM 973 and expected high volumes of traffic connecting to work destinations in the Urban Core, Transportation and Natural Resources staff have identified the need to study the use of roundabouts as a traffic safety measure to calm traffic. As plans develop for Rio de Vida, future collector level intersections would offer an opportunity apply this traffic calming technique especially for collector intersections west of Austin's Colony subdivision.

10. Recommend change. Agree the Concept Plan should reflect the proposed land use intensity shown on page 22.
11. Amend Concept Plan to show separate park parcels along the Colorado River, 1) City of Austin Parcel and 2) Austin Colony Home Owners Association (HOA) parcel.