



Citizens Bond Advisory Committee Transportation and Natural Resources

411 West 13th Street
Executive Office Building
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 473-9430
FAX (512) 473-9436

August 12, 2005

Travis County Commissioners' Court
Travis County Administration Building
314 W. 11th Street
5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78701

RE: Final Recommendations - Bond Project List

Dear Commissioners:

I am submitting my last report on behalf of the Citizens Bond Advisory Committee 2005 for your consideration. The presentation of this report is scheduled for August 16th, 2005 which is your next Court voting session. We have just completed a series of five public hearings where citizens submitted comments that were heard and recorded. They are being presented as **Attachment A** along with this letter.

As you know, over the last seven months, our 14-member committee has considered project proposals, conducted site visits and considered the need for a 2005 bond election. We have sought in every way to complete the charge to the committee from the Commissioners Court.

Our first charge was to decide if there was a need for a November 2005 Bond election. The need for a bond election was supported through staff-proposed needs totaling nearly \$450 million, along with public support of the proposed projects received at the series of public meetings and hearings, and through stakeholder correspondence received by mail and e-mails. After establishing the need for a bond election, the Committee was charged with presenting a bond package of approximately \$100 million. As mentioned with the established need and public sentiment during the public involvement process, the Committee felt it needed to raise the cap. At the August 9, 2005 Committee meeting, the County's Planning and Budget Office presented an update of the County's debt capacity. With the overwhelming comments from constituents to add projects to the list, the Committee felt that we would present a package equal to the new debt capacity presented by the Planning and Budget Office.

The demand for increased transportation mobility projects was evidenced by public testimony from many different citizens and organized community groups. With regard to Parks and Open Space, much of the public testimony received supported the Reimers Ranch acquisition, the Open Space proposition and the need for a public skate park. The Committee included an additional \$60 million that we recommend the Court issue as a

stand-alone proposition that would state to the voters that a vote for the additional \$60 million would require a tax increase. Public testimony from environmental groups such as the Hill Country Conservancy, Trust for Public Land and Save Our Springs Alliance was received in favor of the stand-alone proposition of \$60 million.

Our proposed recommendations are of course, subject to change and may be altered based upon Court decision. In addition to the citizen comments attached, the Committee is also forwarding to you the ***Final Project List of Recommendations (Attachment B)*** and their associated costs. The final total cost of the recommended projects is \$119,502,685. This amount includes the following:

<u>Project Categories</u>	<u>Amount Recommended</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Mobility	\$46,918,809	39.26%
Drainage and Flood Plain Buyout	\$9,629,676	8.06%
Parks and Open Space	\$39,454,200	33.02%
Jails Facility Improvements	\$23,500,000	19.66%
<u>Stand Alone Proposition</u>	<u>Amount Recommended</u>	
Open Space	\$60,000,000	

Attachment C is the final report from each of the three sub-committees. Included in the list of recommended projects are four projects that require public/private partnership agreements. A presentation by staff on the Public/Private Policy Guidelines (**Attachment D**) was made to the Committee at one of the meetings. The four projects were included because the Committee felt that the roads were valid projects warranted by transportation needs of the general public. In addition, the majority property owners have indicated their willingness to enter into public/private agreements with the County in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the Commissioners Court on July 12th 2005. The Committee resolved that the guidelines adopted be embedded in the bond covenant.

We want to express our appreciation to the members of the Citizens Bond Advisory Committee as well as to the Travis County staff. Many hours of work and substantial discussion took place during the production of these recommendations. It has been a pleasure serving Travis County.

Sincerely,

Mr. Richard Moya, Chair and Mr. Perry Lorenz, Vice Chair
Travis County Citizens Bond Advisory Committee

Attachments:

- Attachment A (Public Hearing Speaker Comments)
- Attachment B (Project List)
- Attachment C (Subcommittee Reports)
- Attachment D (Public /Private Partnership Agreement Guidelines)

CC: Citizens Bond Advisory Committee
Joseph P. Gieselman, Travis County TNR
Mike Trimble, Criminal Justice
Christian Smith, Travis County PBO
David Escamilla, Travis County Attorney
Dana DeBeauvoir, Travis County Clerk

Attachment A

Public Hearing Comments and Stakeholder Correspondence

- July 25, 2005, Pflugerville Justice Center (Courtroom), Public Hearing Comments
- July 26, 2005, Travis County Commissioners Courtroom, Public Hearing Comments
- July 28, 2005, Baty Elementary School (Cafeteria), Public Hearing Comments
- August 3, 2005, Precinct One Satellite Service Center, Public Hearing Comments
- August 4, 2005, Precinct Three Travis County Office Complex (Community Room), Public Hearing Comments
- Stakeholder Correspondence (Separate Attachment)

Travis County 2005 Bond Public Meeting • Speaker Summary
Monday, July 25, 2005 • Pflugerville Justice Center

NAME	COMMENTS
1. Larry Havel	Arterial A (Mobility Project #1): Is concerned about traffic on Springdale Road. He appreciates what the County has done with traffic calming devices. He mentioned that only one citizen who spoke in opposition of Arterial A at the meeting of June 22 nd lives in the neighborhood while the others do not. Those that don't are actually using Springdale to cut through. He urges committee to reconsider Arterial A and put it back on the bond project list and to start negotiating with Waste Management to obtain the right-of-way for Arterial A. Is in support of the drainage and flood plain project #6.
2. Mark McAfee	Is in favor of Arterial A, but wants a different alignment from what the County has shown him. Is in favor of Flood Plain #6. He mentioned that he owns a business on a street that intersects with Arterial A and is not for increasing traffic in the neighborhood, but he is in favor of finding a solution to the problem.
3. John Hutchinson	Is in favor of Arterial A: He stated that when the County approached them 9 years ago it was such an obvious, doable, logical, placement of a road; it didn't upset or interfere with any homes, it didn't go into anybody's residential property. He did mention that if Arterial A is not built, 31,042 homes that are in northeast Travis County that are being built on Pioneer Farms, will not have northbound access and drivers will cut through his neighborhood. His neighborhood has heavy traffic. Is concerned that, if the road doesn't get built and the bond package does not go through with Arterial A, Waste Management will probably get their permit and be able to extend the longevity of the landfill. Does not want to get stuck with both dirty ends of the stick; traffic and landfill that he doesn't want.
4. Andrea Michaels	Is in favor of Arterial A and drainage project on Walnut Creek. She has the same concerns as John Hutchinson. She did mention that the City of Austin has huge plans to annex this area around (SH130). Asked that the bond committee put Arterial A back on the bond package and in the CAMPO plan. The neighborhood cannot afford to wait any longer.
5. Kristina Kubeck	Supports the drainage and flood plain project #6. She lives on Quietie Drive and her backyard has suffered serious erosion and

is in danger of sliding into Walnut Creek. Is very glad the project made the list. Is also in support of Project #1 (Arterial A). She asked the bond committee to reconsider Arterial A. It's a desperately needed road.

6. Jeff Gullahorn Strongly supports the Howard Lane #1, Howard Lane #2 and Cameron Road projects.
7. Nathan Weiss Supports Howard Lane projects, Cameron Road and Pecan Street Projects.
8. Jane Falkenberg Supports Mobility Projects #1 (Arterial A) and drainage and flood plain project #6. She stated that Arterial A is desperately needed. If they don't get it her neighborhood is gone. She experiences traffic on a daily basis because her street is a shortcut. Traffic from Georgetown, Hutto, Round Rock, and Pflugerville cut through her street (she knows because she's behind them waiting to get onto 290; she reads the soccer mom signs & what school they go to on windows). She thanked Joe Gieselman and the County staff for putting up traffic calming devices in her neighborhood.
9. Joyce Thoresen In favor of Project #6. She asked the committee to reinstate Arterial A in the bond package. Arterial A is a safety and quality of life project.
10. Janet Marsh Asked the committee to reinstate Braker Lane II. She brought with her a printout that shows justification for reinstating Braker Lane II from FM 973 to Taylor Lane. Relayed that the developers were willing to cost participate with the County on the project from FM 973 to Taylor Lane (owner to provide ½ the cost of design, all the right-of-way and ½ the cost of construction for a 4-lane divided arterial). Relayed that she thought the owners between Taylor Lane and Burleson Manor Road would probably work with the County at the same cost participation level.
12. Pat McCord He explained the difference between a street skateboarder and a traditional one: a) a traditional boarder skates on concrete with rolling edges, and b) a street boarder skates on stairs, benches, etc. A street skate park is for a very advanced skating community. Is in favor of building a public skateboard that accommodates different skill levels. He showed committee slides of skate parks he visited, and submitted copies of the slides to the CBAC committee.

Travis County 2005 Bond Public Meeting • Speaker Summary
Tuesday, July 26, 2005 • Commissioners' Court Room

NAME	COMMENTS
Scott Johnson	Consider when you put the bond package together to get a presentation from TNR about how to structure the bond projects so they have high environmental standards including requiring cleaning burning vehicles and equipment in their construction. Also consider effects of projects on air quality two or three years from now. Set high environmental standards for projects to minimize the air pollution released from the construction of these projects.
Jane Faulkenburg	Ms. Faulkenberg lives north of 290 East, off Springdale Road, and supports reinstating Arterial A into the bond package. She states that the stress level of living along this road since she moved there in 1989 has increased; the street is now a racetrack for drivers cutting through to IH 35 or Cameron Road. She also cites an incident where a car hit the curb, and rolled over three times; the passengers were driving a stolen car and intoxicated. These types of incidents increase the neighborhood stress level. She asked the CBAC to please include Arterial A in the bond package.
Dominique Chavez	Mr. Chavez, with the Capital Area Transportation Coalition, supports additional funding for mobility projects. He thanked the CBAC for their hard work over the last six months, and for facing the challenge of balancing priorities. He asks the CBAC to be bold in terms of the important mobility projects, and states that this community has a crisis with people trying to find ways to get around town. He notes that on one of the slides shown earlier, the challenges of federal-state funding is shown; he says that everyone is fighting for the money, and a lot of times it's just reserved for the state and federal highway systems. His concern with the bond proposal is that \$54 million for mobility projects is not bold enough. He asks the Committee to add a separate bond item to this package so the voters can choose whether they want to approve additional road projects that address their local mobility issues. He says that in the 2001 bond election, the community overwhelmingly approved \$150 million for mobility even though those proposals result in increased taxes. Therefore, he wants voters to have the opportunity, just as they will have with the open space proposition, to vote for a stand-alone roadway and mobility proposition that is tied to a tax increase. He thinks that voters should be allowed to choose, instead of the Committee making the decision, what roads get built.

The 2001 bond package amounted to \$3.50 per month in tax increases for the average homeowner. Those bonds were approved overwhelmingly. Almost 60% of voters approved. I am here today to suggest the concept of having additional items placed on the ballot and offer voters to voice their opinion.

John Hutchinson

Lives off Springdale Road and US 290, and would like the CBAC to reconsider funding the building of Arterial A. He states that many years ago they began planning SH130 and the first plans included Arterial A. At first SH 130 was where the present alignment of Arterial A is now. Once the alignment for SH 130 was moved east, that left that the strip of land open which the COA got dedicated to Arterial A. The section of road we are concerned about is between Blue Goose and US 290. The reason why we are so desperate and that we are emphasizing to our people to present our side of the story is mainly because we have a neighborhood coming in north of us on Sprinkle Road or Sprinkle Cut-Off. That neighborhood will consist of 3,142 homes, which is 30,000 plus cars per day going somewhere. If Arterial A gets built, that will be the road for this traffic; if not, there are no plans to build anything. Cameron Road back north is like a parking lot. There are lots of wrecks and people. If anyone has experienced Parmer Lane and Dessau, you can sit through that intersection 5 or 6 lights even without bad weather. Add the other problems, and you got an issue that goes on for hours which will make you late for work every time. There is no better north-south road on this ladder of arterials. You have all these projects that are proposed to be built in northern Travis County that connect east-west; well, what about us. If we don't reinstate Arterial A, Springdale Road would have to be widened, with turning lanes, to 114', which is a problem because it is my neighbor's house. So if we want a north-south corridor, they are going to have to come down Springdale Road or Arterial A. If they come down Springdale Road, sooner or later, that road will have to be widened or some other route is going to be picked. We have looked and there are no other routes that can be pinpointed at this time. The problem you have is limited funds. Also, it goes through Waste Management's landfill system, which is the real problem why some people do not want this built. It will force Waste Management to prematurely move to the Wilder tract, which they are not trying to get a permit. That gives them a much longer life expectancy to do landfill operations. That is why this bond package is so important to Arterial A because of a time crunch. So we are asking for you to reconsider or add it to bond package and raise the amount. It may be expensive but it has several issues including an intersection with the highway, and if it is not placed on bond package now; its over, and the other option (widen Springdale Road) is going to be expensive.

- Angela Michaels Speaking on behalf of the drainage & flood plain project on Walnut Creek, and requesting that Arterial A be placed back in the bond package. She states that Arterial A is separate from the landfill problem. The tremendous amount of development being planned in the area, and the City of Austin's intention to annex the area make Arterial A necessary. She believes that if Arterial A is not placed back into the bond package, her neighborhood will be destroyed.
- Joyce Thoresen Asks for Arterial A to be reinstated into the bond package. She says that years ago it was designated as an alternative route to Springdale Road to help the neighborhood, and that it is still needed because increased traffic volume and speed has become a threat to the neighborhood's safety and quality of life. Ms. Thoresen says that people who live in Harris Branch and Pflugerville regularly use Springdale to reach US 290. Arterial A would provide a more direct route for these residents, to the north and east, to access US 290.
- Beth Ann Sprengel Attended several meetings and would like to speak to the CBAC about the jail proposition. She states that the County is often referred to as "meat and potatoes" government, and that a part of the "meat and potatoes" is corrections and rehabilitation services. Although this is not "sexy" it is something that the County is required to address by the state. She asks that the committee consider all options, look hard at the numbers on the jail, and consider the impact that it has on the entire County budget.
- Kristina Kubeck As a member of Walnut Place Neighborhood Association and a resident of this neighborhood since 1976, Ms. Kubeck stated her support for Drainage and Flood Plain Project #6. "My backyard has suffered severe erosion and needs all the help that it can get." She also supports Mobility Project #1, Arterial A. She feels that, without Arterial A, her neighborhood will be overwhelmed by traffic from the new developments occurring in the area. She asks the CBAC to please reconsider Arterial A and notes that funding for a north – south arterial in a northeast section of Travis County must be secured now.
- Amy Wanamaker She thanks the Committee for their service and states her support for the \$60 million stand-alone bond proposition for open space that the Committee is recommending. She feels that the County has an opportunity to purchase open space now, while it is still available, and states that it may not be available several years from now. She thinks that this would be a significant investment for our future; and that a tax increase averaging \$16.00 per year per household is a fair allocation to ensure having open space and clean water in our future.

Colin Clark Supports the park recommendations and open space proposition. He emphasizes that there is need throughout the county for open space protection. He tells the committee that he, along with Amy Wanamaker, was part of the Southwest Growth Dialogue Committee that recommended protecting 6,000 acres in Southwest Travis County, and that he feels that there is need in other areas of the county as well. He identifies the City's Walnut Creek greenbelt as a place that could be built on; he also says that Gilleland Creek, areas near SH130, and other creeks in eastern Travis County and the Colorado River would benefit from open space protection.

Roger Baker Interested in both roadway issues and the separate proposition to purchase natural ranch areas on the ballot. He supports parks and open space projects but believes that people inside the city should not see their parks deteriorate while new parks are built without long term funding for their maintenance. He feels that consideration should be given for the long-term maintenance costs of these proposals, including the jail project. He's skeptical about the road projects, saying that they tend to be public subsidies for private land speculation. He's also very skeptical of public-private partnerships for building over the Aquifer, and believes that it is a bad idea. He would like to see development concentrated inside or near the city because compact growth is much cheaper to pay for in the long run. Mr. Baker believes that we should have metropolitan government that combines City and County governments.

Charles Betts Executive Director of the Downtown Development Alliance that consists of the property owners in the downtown area that are assessing themselves an additional tax to pay for projects in the downtown area. Mr. Betts asks the Committee to consider including payment for 1/3 of the costs for Waller Creek flood control project in the County bond package.

Eric Anderson Wants to discuss trails, and asks staff to look into ground breaking work on open space and determine what percentage of mobility funding goes for bike projects and sidewalks. He made a specific comment on sidewalks, asking that the County not build sidewalks that no one wants to use because they are too close to traffic. He suggested that sidewalks be sited 10-20 feet off the roadside. He supports all parks and open space projects. One thing that is not in bond package proposal is a trail built on the Reserves Canyon Texas, which has problems because it does not have all the funding. He is in support of the Lance Armstrong dedicated to right away. Would like for staff to focus on making trails connection if it receives federal funding.

Ted Siff Mr. Siff thanked committee members for giving their time to serve on the bond committee. He also commended their recommendations

for parks and open space projects but noted that many cities are ahead of Travis County in acquisition of open space. He supports acquisition of more open space and parkland, as well as completing acquisition of land for the Balcones Canyonlands Preserve. He also thinks that the open space purchased with bond funds should allow people to have public access. He noted that the Commissioners Court is dedicated to improving the County park system, and that the County parks well maintained.

Glen Hodges

Mr. Hodges represents landowners along the alignment of the proposed extension of Howard Lane at SH 130. Some of these landowners have been there for many years, and they support the road project and would like to see it built. He thanked the Committee for their hard work, and thanked staff for including both segments of Howard Lane in the preliminary recommendation for regional mobility bond projects, noting that the Howard Lane extension is included in the CAMPO plan. Mr. Hodges said that the landowners have been willing to donate the right of way, and have also offered to share the engineering design and construction costs for the road section crossing their property. He stated that the County and City are working on an inter-local agreement for this project, and that there is lots of local support for the road. There is also a public private agreement that has been drafted and currently being discussed with County staff. He hopes that the County will keep this project in the bond proposal.

Travis County 2005 Bond Public Hearing • Speaker Summary
Thursday, July 28, 2005 • Baty Elementary School Cafeteria

NAME	COMMENTS
1. John Hutchinson	<p>In favor of Arterial A, requests that it be put back on the bond package. He said basically the entire bond package for Northeast Austin, that's 130 related, runs east/west. He said right now there are two arterial roads, Cameron Rd. on the west, and Harris Branch on the east that run north/south. Every single north/south corridor connects to Springdale Rd. He said we are trying to reduce future traffic in our neighborhood. He said the only sticky point concerning this road is that it has to go through 2 of Waste Management's cells, which are 9 and 10. Finally, he expressed that he has to decide if he wants to put up with traffic forever or landfills for 10/15 years. He chooses to trade the landfills for roads. Committee member Ms. Penridge asked Mr. Hutchinson to identify the area cells on the map. She also asked Mr. Hutchinson if he was referring to the landfill along Blue Goose. He responded that the landfill is BFI Landfill and it is currently applying for an expansion permit. Committee member John Hockenyos asked the expense of this particular project? Ms. Penridge answered \$18.5 million.</p>
2. Angela Michaels	<p>In favor of Walnut Creek Erosion project and Arterial A., and states that the City of Austin is planning to annex a tremendous amount of acreage from SH130 to the proposed landfill. Feels that the COA is strongly encouraging development in this area and asks the committee to put Arterial A back in the bond package.</p>
3. Joyce Thoresen	<p>Supports Arterial A, and asked the committee to restore Arterial A to the recommended bond package. She commented on a "...few misconceptions that are floating around":</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) <i>The soil in the area is not suitable for road construction:</i> When engineers designed SH 130 they thought it was suitable. Arterial A is now the alignment where SH 130 was before it was moved to the east.2) <i>Arterial A will aggravate drainage problems on Walnut Creek:</i> The fact is that Arterial A will cut through 2 cells of already permitted landfill areas, thus making land filling in that area impossible.3) <i>The belief that Arterial A can be re-routed:</i> Arterial A is the only north/south arterial between Dessau and Giles. The only other north/south road is Springdale, and Springdale is a neighborhood street with driveways,

which reach the entire length of Walnut Place. The fact is that the northern part of Arterial A is in the Austin City limits and has already been dedicated. We need the southern part to connect Blue Goose to US 290.

- 4) The belief that the large meeting held in Pct. 1 on June 4 was in opposition to Arterial A is a misconception because Arterial A was not the subject of the meeting, and was not mentioned.

4. Kristina Kubeck Supports the drainage and floodplain project #6. She also supports Arterial A, and states that misleading statements have been made about this project. One such statement is that Travis County has authority to revoke landfill permits or evict them; she notes that landfills are governed by the State. She also says that funding for a north/south arterial road must be secured now, and asked the committee to include Arterial A in this bond package.
5. Glen Shield Spoke about the Slaughter Lane project that was considered for the 2001 bond program but was not included because there were plans to build a City park in its path. Since the park didn't happen, the road needs to be in this bond program and built now. He also mentioned that he read comments from the bond public meetings on-line, and didn't see mention about projects in Pct. 4. He thinks that there is a need for traffic improvements in this area, and would like for the county to help the city build parks in the south part of the county because Southeast Metro doesn't serve that area well. Ms. Penridge asked if he was referring to east or west of IH 35. Mr. Shield answered east and south of IH 35.
6. Corey Fields Supports Reimers Ranch project, and hopes that it will become the SW Metro Park.
7. Mike Blizzard Thanked the committee for the \$60 million dollar Stand-Alone proposition for natural areas calling it a really good, true and wise investment. Citizen has lived in Travis County for over 20 years, Pct. 4 for ten years, and voted for Margaret Gomez for over 10 years. He said there is evidence that making these sorts of investments actually saves money in the long run for the taxpayers. It means also getting ahead of growth in that area. Investment is needed in western Travis County, where the LCRA is now supplying central water service which will substantially increase the rate and density of growth in that area. Eventually, the density will start to impact the water quality in Lake Travis. I think the investment is worth an additional \$16 dollars a year.

Travis County 2005 Bond Public Hearing • Speaker Summary
Thursday, August 03, 2005 • Precinct One Satellite Service Center

NAME	COMMENTS
1. Jon Klumpp	Citizen says he's not for or against Arterial "A", and asked (for the committee's consideration), has there been engineer studies to come up with this \$8 million dollar figure. He felt that the road would cost more than the projected amount because of the issue of the black clay soil they'd have to resolve first. He said the estimates on the proposed Manor airport talked about removing 20 feet of soil to get down to a stable ground to build. He said when Chimney Hill was first built; there were a lot of problems with the soil. He also said that this project will only benefit a few people but Travis County will be responsible for maintenance for many years to come. His interest is more in the upgrade of other roads, primarily Ferguson Rd.
2. Marie Ingram	Citizen is in opposition of Arterial "A" on the basis of unresolved issues and the amount of money required for the project. Commissioner's voted to oppose the landfill, but the attachment of Arterial "A" would extend the life of waste management for approximately 25 years. She said that Joe Gieselman's comments at the Commissioner's Court meeting on July 19, 2005 stated that TNR, which is the Executive Management discussed the removal of Arterial "A" from the bond package due to multiple issues related to this project. She said the minutes of that meeting are on the Internet.
3. John Hutchinson	Citizen is a resident of Walnut Place and is very passionate about the reinstatement of Arterial "A" to the 2005 bond package. He presented a map of Travis County and stated reasons why Arterial "A" should be built. He said right now all we have are two roads, Cameron Rd. on the west, and Harris Branch on the east. Seven miles between the two points may be Hwy 290, and every single North/South traveler goes through Springdale Rd. He's been fighting landfills for 10 years and should not have to decide if he wants to put up with traffic forever or landfills for another 10 to 15 years. It will be another 5 years before the opportunity comes again if it's not selected.

4. Angela Michaels	Citizen is a resident of Walnut Place and is very passionate about the reinstatement of Arterial "A" to the 2005 bond package. Says they are being buried because of current developments, and there is a tremendous amount of future developments going on. Soon the City of Austin will annex a large portion of land in their area in the near future from SH130 down to Cameron road. Arterial "A" should be intersecting at the new improvement of Hwy 290. Ms. Michaels asked everyone present, in support of Arterial "A" to raise their hands, which were approximately 13 citizens. Following a neighborhood meeting the citizen's knocked doors with petitions that were addressed to the Travis County Judge, Commissioners, and the Citizens' Bond Committee. 163 petitions were from Walnut Place and Colonial Place, Chimney Hill's had not been collected.
5. Kristina Kubeck	Citizen lives in Walnut Place on Quietie Drive, supports Drainage & Flooding, and the reinstatement of Arterial "A". Resident's back yard suffers erosion and is in danger of land sliding into Walnut creek so she's very grateful that this project was included in the package. Ms. Kubeck requests that the committee please put Arterial "A" back into the 2005 bond package. She said we desperately need a north/south road to prevent being over run by traffic from new developments. Contrary to misleading statements, Travis County has no authority to revoke landfill permits or evict them; they are governed by the TCEQ. Arterial "A" will create a buffer between the neighborhood and the landfill.
6. Jane Falkenberg	Citizen is in support of reinstatement of Arterial "A" to the bond package. Homeowner gave a mental imagery of why this road is needed. When she purchased her house in 1989, it was the most peaceful, beautiful neighborhood and not just a cookie cutter neighborhood. It is still like that, but if we don't get Arterial "A" put back into the bond package, we're in trouble. Traffic will be horrible when the development comes, however, the County came to our assistance and installed traffic calming devices, and it helped. She is mad and need help. Arterial "A" would relieve her neighborhood and make everyone happy.
7. Joyce Best	Citizen is opposed reinstating Arterial "A" to the bond package. No road in Travis County should be funded based on an agreement with a landfill that trades the road for a 25- year expansion to the detriment of thousands of residence. Since Arterial "A" may not be built for 20 years, 2005 bond money need to be spent on projects that will improve existing roads now.
8. Celia Israel	Citizen is in support of Arterial "A", which does not mean that you're also supporting landfills. It's a vote for public safety. With all of the growth, the neighborhood is being ravished so any help would be highly appreciated.

9. Trek English	<p>Citizen is in support of Arterial "A" without the expansion. It is immoral to ask neighborhoods to put up with landfills for 25 more years because we need a road. Don't know if it's the best place to put a road because there hasn't been any public meetings held. The taxpayers are asked to pay 18.5 million dollars for a 1.5 mile road without the benefit of one public meeting. We have the largest landfill in Texas, which is only 8 miles from downtown. Arterial "A" is not a road deal anymore but a landfill expansion road deal. Obviously waste management must be afraid that they are not going to get their third expansion, there were expansions in 1981, 1990, and now 2005. As long as Arterial "A" is on the package with the expansion, I will not support it.</p>
10. Dan Pyka	<p>Citizen opposes reinstatement of Arterial "A" to the bond package. First stated corrections to his misspelled name on the June 22nd minutes. Said that Arterial "A" is not going to help Chimney Hill and there's no way we can get down to Arterial "A" without getting on Hwy 290 anyway. Mr. Pyka said he was the president of the association and he hadn't heard anything about this project so the difference in the two Chimney Hills needs to be distinguished. There's Chimney Hill Town homes and Chimney Hill North. He has been a resident of Chimney Hill since 1978 before the landfills and had no input on that. He echoes what Ms. English said that there has been no public meetings, and it would be unconscionable to reinstate Arterial "A" without first having input from the community.</p>
11. Joyce Thoresen	<p>A 36 year resident of Walnut Place neighborhood requests that Arterial "A" be reinstated in the recommendations to the bond package. Citizen stated that Arterial "A" is not on their side of the tributary or the power line or pipeline. Arterial "A" was designed over 10 years ago as an alternate route to Springdale road, for years everything was in place but the funding. We were thrilled when it was in the first bond package. Some facts are that Arterial "A" will improve drainage; the northern part of Arterial "A" from Parmer Ln. to Bluegoose St., is in the Austin city limits and has already been dedicated. We need the southern part to connect Bluegoose to US 290. Arterial "A" is a road issue and a safety issue, please restore to the bond package.</p>

12. Larry Havel	A 28 year resident of Walnut Place and the treasurer of the neighborhood association, asked the committee to reconsider and recommend to the Commissioner's and Judge Biscoe that Arterial "A" be placed back on the bond issue. He asked that the committee at least let the voter's have an opportunity to vote for or against this critical issue. Traffic on Springdale Rd. is already a problem, and we know more is coming. With all the new construction north of our neighborhood, the projected traffic count is over 3000 per day, and we will lose our neighborhood as it currently exist. Mr. Havel asked Coach Davis, who is a member of the committee, how he plans to get out of his neighborhood in a few years without Arterial "A". He said the people that spoke in earlier meetings opposed to Arterial "A", does not represent the majority of our neighbors, which was identified on the petitions handed out earlier. Mr. Havel said that Arterial "A" will provide a buffer in our neighborhood and the landfills by substituting 9 & 10 to the Wylder track. The County can negotiate the Right-of-Way from waste management now, but maybe not later. Please reconsider.
13. Charlie McCabe	Citizen is a long time park and trail advocate, in support of Parks & Open Space. Citizen who works for the Austin Park's Foundation congratulated the committee on preserving the scope and the improvements proposed for parks, especially on the east side. It's great that the 3 east side destination parks are going to get sizeable infrastructure improvements. It serves a growing area. Also supports the \$60 million Stand-Alone proposal.
14. Melanie McAfee	Citizen speaks against reinstating Arterial "A", in hopes that the committee not only keep it out of the bond package, but make strong recommendations against it. The main and most important reason is because of the connection to the landfill expansion. Public private partnerships are a good way to raise needed funds, but this is one example where public debate should be mandatory. These two landfills commit a problem in the neighborhood for many years that the landfills have not been good neighbors. To put the road in the bond package means that the landfills will negotiate their contribution, but no one knows what that means. After fighting the landfills for 10 years, my educated guess is that they will donate a roadway for a massive expansion. This is not a democratic process.
15. Mark McAfee	Business owner in the Arterial "A" area, is against Arterial "A". He spoke out against Arterial "A" being on this bond package but not taking it out of the 20/30 Plan. Waste management has one of the largest fines of any landfill in Texas history, and they got it reduced by telling the TECQ that they were going to close down by the year 2013. The proposition looks like a road but it is a landfill expansion, here's the permit. Many thanks to people who have helped us in this fight, this is the latest in an ongoing series of tricks by these companies until they get what they want, which is the landfill expansion. The road is basically a bribe for the expansion.

16. Larry Beard	<p>Citizen is in support of reinstating the Decker Lane Rd. project into the bond package with a Cap. He said at a 03/21/05 meeting Mr. Gieselman said that this road will require an expansion into Wylder Track stating an estimate of \$4.9 million dollars for 3500 linear feet. He said he became concerned with that number but he's not an engineer so he won't refute that, but for the biggest bang for your buck, he has letters of support from Gary Farmer, President of Heritage Title Company Of Austin, and Sondra Creighton, Director of COA Public Works. Mr. Beard says he does not want the County's half of \$4.9 million dollars, and he is willing to cap their expenditure at \$1.5 million dollars. The pledge his company is willing to guarantee that they will not ask the County to spend over \$1.5 million dollars, so it's a very minimal contribution from the County because we think it's a private and public joint venture between the COA, Travis County and ourselves.</p>
17. Jim Carpenter	<p>Citizen is in support of Braker Lane – FM973 –Taylor Ln. He spoke of growth going East, with over 40 thousand lots in process of being planted right now. Before we have another 5- year window of opportunity on roadways, we're going to see about 20% of that on the ground. The subdivisions are being built by mega builders, which put hundreds of houses on the ground at one time in a quarter or two quarter period. This particular road is in Austin's ETJ but not the city limits, the rate of growth and the ability for developers to put down a more profitable development at a lower cost can only happen in Austin's ETJ. When we added up the total growth that's happening on this east side it represents between 10 and 18% of the total home sales market in the Austin metro area. We're looking at basically \$11.5 million dollars to build, and what we propose is better than 50/50 with the County, we propose to put the real estate into the deal, which is somewhere near \$1 million dollars. So instead of the \$8.4 million, the County's share would be roughly \$2.9 million dollars, and the developers share would be roughly \$4 million dollars, but we're only prepared to do that on a on time offer. We can build this road in a delivery time of 12 to 13 months.</p>
18. Marion Childress-Usher	<p>Citizen is against the reinstatement of Arterial "A" to the bond package as it relates to the landfills. Citizen lives in Harris Branch and says that she does not use Springdale Rd. to get to Hwy 290, and neither does she use Springdale Rd. north of Hwy 290 for any reason. Her suggestion is that the road project involving waste management be treated as a domain issue, and receive the assessed value of its' property without given additional landfill years. The area is a fast growing residential area and the presence of the landfills are hazardous on several levels, and contribute significantly to diminished clean air space and capacity.</p>

19. Clif Davis	Citizen is in support of a much larger bond package. There's \$64 million dollars worth of road projects and we've recently heard presentations that there is a lot of growth happening along SH130 and that's evident. He submits that the voter's would approve of a much larger bond package if given the opportunity as they did in the last bond election, which was about \$160 million. He's not arguing against the other projects, he's just suggesting the package be bigger. He said, along with a few other roads, Arterial "A" deserves consideration.
20. Garity Elliot	Citizen is in support of reinstating Arterial "A" to the bond package. Citizen lives on Quiette Dr., walks every morning and use to walk across Springdale Rd. but aren't able to do that anymore. She says if we don't use the opportunity now to make Arterial "A" happen many people are going to regret it. She said it is time to prepare for the arrival of the 3000 families as someone projected earlier, and feels that this road would be an asset to them. She also said that she feels that Arterial "A" would curtail the expansion of the landfills instead of increase them.
21. Janet Klots	Citizen is against the reinstatement of Arterial "A" to the bond package as it relates to the landfills. Expressed that it is a mistake to put Arterial "A" and the landfill expansion in the same thought, they should both stand on their on merits. Arterial "A" seems to be a very expensive road for what the County would be getting, so I'm not sure that it's acceptable to spend that much money on a road ever.
22. Cynthia Maynor	Citizen lives on Quiette Dr. in a home affected by the erosion problems. She is in support of reinstating Arterial "A" to the bond package, and in support, and thankful for the Walnut Creek project on the bond package. Citizen says that drivers almost have head on collisions traveling north at the Sprinkle cut-off to work. She expressed that an alternative route is really needed and we shouldn't wait until traffic increases to do something about it.

Travis County 2005 Bond Public Hearing • Speaker Summary
Thursday, August 4, 2005 • Pct. 3 Travis County Office Complex

NAME	COMMENTS
1. Britt Jones	Citizen supports Reimer's Ranch and the Skateboard Park proposal. He first thanked the bond committee for the opportunity to speak. He is a board member of the Austin Ryder's Bike Club, and referenced Reimer's Ranch as being the jewel of Travis County. He spoke of how beautiful the rock climbing area was, and that the fishing there was unlike any other county had to offer. Mr. Jones stated that besides a few of the minor amenities, he'd like the Park to stay as natural as possible.
2. Christopher Klinger	Student at the University of Texas is in favor of keeping Reimer's Ranch on the proposed bond list of projects. He said it's the most gorgeous place he's ever been in his life. He would hate to see it disappear for the citizen's now, and for generations to come.
3. Charlie McCabe	Citizen supports all park and open space projects. This is the last chance to purchase land in Travis County.
4. David Houston	Citizen supports the acquisition of Reimer's Ranch. Citizen was born and raised in Austin Texas, and highly promotes family values. He says that Reimer's Ranch is the crown jewel in the State of Texas; it's a valuable resource. He spoke of the Monarch butterfly using Reimer's as a resting place on it's way to Mexico in the fall. Asked the bond committee to take this project as a very important research.
5. Valarie Bristol	Citizen is in support of the acquisition to purchase Reimer's Ranch. She was privileged to work on a project next to Reimer's Ranch, and recognized the real beauty. Ms. Bristol also said that Pogue Hollow is a wonderful canyon also, and hope to see it added to the Reimer's Ranch package. She said that Reimer's Ranch is an amazing resource for outdoors, and we need to make sure our children and grandchildren have a beautiful place to live, so please help us get the whole package.
6. Amy Wanamaker	Citizen works for the Trust for Public Land, and supports the bond package for Open Space as well as the \$60 million Stand-Alone project. She says in 5 to 7 years from now we'll be looking at an entirely different place out the window, one way or the other, and we can decide which direction we want that to go.

7. John Hutchinson	<p>Citizen supports the reinstatement of Arterial A. He said on yesterday he found out that in Northeast Travis County, along the corridor of SH-130, there are going to be 40 thousand houses built. He said right now all roads run east/west, and we're asking the County to help us finish a project that goes from Parmer Ln. down to Hwy. 290. He expressed that all roads lead to Springdale Rd. and cars have to come through his neighborhood to get to Hwy 290, which cause problems.</p> <p>Citizen asked to please reinstate.</p>
8. Angela Michaels	<p>Citizen is in favor of Walnut Creek Erosion project and the reinstatement of Arterial A to the bond package. Several Walnut Creek residents signed a petition that indicates they support and need funding and construction of Arterial A. Their neighborhood is suffering with tremendous traffic.</p>
9. Kristina Kubeck	<p>Citizen has lived in Walnut Place since 1976, and supports the reinstatement of Arterial A. She states that she has actively fought the landfill issues for many years, and contrary to misleading statements, the County does not have the authority to revoke permits. Funding for a north/south arterial road must be secured now, traffic will be over-whelming. She said a decision this big should be made by everyone and not manipulated. Ms. Kubeck asked the bond committee to keep Arterial A in this years bond package.</p>
10. Joyce Thoresen	<p>Citizen supports the reinstatement of Arterial A. She also represented her son who lives on Quietie Drive, in favor of the flood plain "buyout" project.</p>
11. Dick Kallerman	<p>Citizen is in support of the \$60 million Stand-Alone project for Natural areas.</p>
12. Luke Bowman	<p>Citizen is in support of Open Space and Reimer's Ranch. States that it is a one- time opportunity.</p>
13. Colin Clark	<p>Citizen supports Parks & Open Space and the \$60 million Stand-Alone proposal to protect natural areas and water quality. He stated that the \$600 hundred thousand recommended for engineering on Reimer's Peacock Road would be better used to buy a conservation easement from land owners in that area. He handed out a report to the bond committee that shows economic advantages of protecting natural areas and open space.</p>
14. Jane Norwood	<p>Citizen loves the untouched land, and supports Parks & Open Space, as well as the \$60 million Stand-Alone project and parks/natural areas.</p>
15. Sarah Baker	<p>Citizen who works at Save our Spring Alliance, is in favor of the \$60 million Stand-Alone project, and the proposal for Parks & Open space. Encourages the bond committee to put both propositions in their final recommendations.</p>

16. Gene Lowenthal	Citizen supports the proposal of \$30 million for parks, \$7 million for Reimer's Ranch and \$60 million Stand-Alone proposal to acquire natural spaces.
17. Christy Muse	Citizen supports the acquisition of Reimer's Ranch and the \$60 million Stand-Alone proposal. Asked the bond committee to reconsider or to reevaluate the need for the Reimer's Peacock Road.
18. Carole Willard	Citizen lives on Hamilton Pool Rd. in which she travels up and down sometimes 8 to 10 times a day. She has teenage children and expresses how extremely dangerous Hamilton Pool road is. Her impression was that Hamilton Pool was a priority road to be improved, much more greater than just the bicycle lanes. Ms. Willard states that everyone is so excited about the purchase of Reimer's Ranch and she is also, but this will increase traffic on Hamilton Pool Rd making it more dangerous and more fatal. She says Hamilton Pool road needs to be widened to 4 lanes and have cross-turn lanes in the middle. She wants to know why it's only going to be improved to just bike lanes when it's so incredibly dangerous, and she would also like the County to think about potential lawsuits, fatalities, and misallocation of funds not being put toward safety.
19. Stephen Nash	Citizen is against building Peacock Rd. He states that it is a safety hazard, and would like to see officers on patrol duty to monitor the roads.
20. Robert Starcher	Citizen supports the proposal for Parks & Open Space, primarily Reimer's Ranch. To date he has collected 2500 signatures in support of Reimer's Ranch.
21. Steven Atherton	Citizen supports Parks & Open Space, primarily Reimer's Ranch, and ask that we do our best to preserve it.
22. Hill Abell	Mountain biker is in favor of Reimer's Ranch Proposal and the \$60 million Stand-Alone proposal for natural space protection, but states that the entire bond package is important.
23. Craig Smith	Citizen is the director of the Edwards Aquifer. He supports the Stand-Alone \$60 million bond propositions for natural areas and various park propositions. He believes that this is the last chance to preserve land.
24. Pepper Morris	Citizen is on the Hill Country Alliance board of directors. He supports the acquisition of Reimer's Ranch and the \$60 million Stand-Alone proposition.

25. Dan Rogers	Life long citizen states that the purchase and construction of Reimer's Ranch will promote mobility problems. He says that \$55 million dollars is insufficient for mobility problems our County faces. He said if a \$115 million dollar total bond project is all that's desired to be put up, we should consider putting additional road projects up for vote to the general public, as with the land and open space purchases. Citizen's will surely support it.
26. Mara Eurich	Citizen lives on Hamilton Pool road expresses she misses camping at Reimer's Ranch, and supports the acquisition of Reimer's Ranch. She states that the parks are over worked therefore not servicing the Community; we need more.
27. Hugh Winkler	Citizen is in favor of Open Space and acquiring Reimer's Ranch. It's important to acquire Pogue Creek and spend money on water quality agreements. Would like to see bike lanes on Hamilton Pool Rd. Also stated that the money used for engineering Hamilton Pool Rd could be better spent. He also stated that it is interesting to see Peacock road open up when it's been a private road for so long.
28. George Cofer	Citizen is the director of the Hill Country Alliance, and in support of the \$60 million Stand-Alone proposition as well as Parks & Open Space. Expresses this may be the last opportunity to purchase at these prices.
29. Pat Peacock Harrison	Citizen says that Peacock/Reimer's Rd has been open for a long time, and maintained by the county. She said it was a problem for us as ranchers because the gates kept being left open. It's not as big of an issue now because of they have a wild life preserve option. She said, personally, it is an infringement on us because of the traffic, but it's a wonderful access to Hwy.71, and a wonderful way for the bikers to get through to Hwy.71. She feels it's a win/win situation.
30. David Willie	Citizen supports the acquisition of Reimer's Ranch. Asked the bond committee to do what they can to save it.

**2005 Citizens Bond Advisory Committee
Final Project List of Recommendations
8-9-2005**

Mobility Projects

Pct. #	Project Name	Project Limits	CBAC Recom. 7/12/2005	Revised Costs 8/9/2005	CBAC Recommendation 8/9/2005
1,2	Howard Lane I	Dessau to Cameron Rd.	\$ 11,900,000	\$ 13,908,103	\$ 13,908,103
1	Howard Lane II *	COA limits to east of SH 130	\$ 4,753,476	\$ 6,732,252	\$ 6,732,252
1	Kimbro Rd./Parsons Rd. Bridge	Low Water Crossing Replacement	\$ 4,900,000	\$ 3,239,984	\$ 3,239,984
1	Wells Branch Pkwy. *	Boulder Ridge sub to Cameron Rd.	\$ 1,632,006	\$ 2,778,590	\$ 2,778,590
1,2	Cameron Rd.	SH 130 to Bridge 106	\$ 8,330,000	\$ 8,925,553	\$ -
2	Gattis School Rd.	CR 122 to east of Huntington Trails sub.	\$ 6,975,965	\$ 6,705,399	\$ 6,705,399
2	Jesse Bohls Rd. Bridge #231	At Wilbarger Creek	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,832,704	\$ 1,832,704
2	Pecan Street*	Pflugerville limits to SH 130	\$ 4,657,700	\$ 3,714,430	\$ 3,714,430
3	Reimers-Peacock Rd. (Prelim. Eng./ROW)*	Hamilton Pool Rd. to SH 71	\$ 600,000	\$ 825,268	\$ -
3	Hamilton Pool Rd. I (Design Only)	RM 12 to Reimers-Peacock Rd.	\$ 404,219	\$ 419,071	\$ 419,071
3	Hamilton Pool Rd. II (Design Only)	Reimers-Peacock Rd. to Pedernales River	\$ 562,051	\$ 578,546	\$ 578,546
3	FM 1431 (Right-of-Way Only)	Trails End area re-alignment	\$ 240,000	\$ 240,000	\$ 240,000
3	FM 1626 (Right-of-Way Only)	Hays County line to Brodie Lane	\$ 160,000	\$ 160,000	\$ 160,000
3	FM 1826 (Right-of-Way Only)	US 290 W to Slaughter Lane	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
3	FM 2244 (Right-of-Way Only)	Unincorporated sections	\$ 325,000	\$ 325,000	\$ 325,000
4	Slaughter Ln. I*	Bluff Springs Rd. to McKinney Falls Pkwy.	\$ 7,795,676	\$ 6,234,730	\$ 6,234,730
Total for Mobility Projects:			\$ 54,476,093	\$ 56,669,630	\$ 46,918,809

Drainage/Flood Plain Buyout Projects

Pct. #	Project Name	CBAC Recom. 7/12/2005	Revised Costs 8/9/2005	CBAC Recommendation 8/9/2005
1	Imperial Valley Drive (Drainage Project)	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,977,536	\$ 1,977,536
1	Quiette Drive/Walnut Creek Drainage	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,810,000	\$ 1,810,000
3	Twin Creeks Arroyo Doble (Buyout of 4 homes)	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000
4	Thoroughbred Farms (Buyout 12 homes)	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,442,140	\$ 1,442,140
4	Caldwell Lane/Garfield Water Supply	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
4	Timber Creek Subdivision (Buyout)	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 3,300,000
Total for Drainage/Flood Plain Buyout:		\$ 9,300,000	\$ 9,629,676	\$ 9,629,676

Parks and Open Space Projects

Pct. #	Project Name	CBAC Recom. 7/12/2005	Revised Costs 8/9/2005	CBAC Recommendation 8/9/2005
1	East Metro Park (Phase 2)	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 7,080,000	\$ 7,080,000
2	Northeast Metro Park (Phase 3)	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 3,998,200	\$ 3,998,200
3	Arkansas Bend Park Improvements	\$ 6,300,000	\$ 7,424,100	\$ 3,375,100
3	Southwest Metro Park (Phase 2)	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 14,404,700	\$ 14,404,700
3	Water Quality Protection Agreements	\$ 3,400,000	\$ 7,286,000	\$ 7,286,000
4	Southeast Metro Park Confluence Trail*	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 3,310,200	\$ 3,310,200
Total for Parks and Open Space:		\$ 30,500,000	\$ 43,503,200	\$ 39,454,200

Total for Mobility/Drainage-Flood Plain/Parks and Open Space	\$ 94,276,093	\$ 109,802,506	\$ 96,002,685
---	----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Jail Facility Improvement Projects

Total for Jail Facility Improvements:	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 23,500,000
--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Total:	\$ 114,276,093	\$ 129,802,506	\$ 119,502,685
---------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Total for Open Space Proposition:	\$ 60,000,000	\$ 60,000,000	\$ 60,000,000
--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Grand Total 2005 Bond:	\$ 174,276,093	\$ 189,802,506	\$ 179,502,685
-------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, makes any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Attachment C

**REPORT OF THE CITIZENS BOND ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JAIL SUBCOMMITTEE
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON BOND PROPOSAL
AUGUST 9, 2005**

Members: Charles Akins, Jim Davis, Richard Moya & Steve Martin

The CBAC received the Travis County Sheriff's Office report "Alternative Strategies & Recommendations on New Jail Replacement Bed Construction" prepared by their Corrections Bureau and presented by Major Davis Balagia. The report concluded with a request that the CBAC consider increasing our recommended \$20,000,000 bond allocation by \$12,660,615. After receiving this report, the Jail Subcommittee met to consider our final recommendation to the full committee. The subcommittee reached a strong consensus that the Corrections Bureau had done a very commendable job of developing alternative strategies in response to our July 14, 2005 recommendations.

While we view the request as valid and reflecting the best efforts of the Corrections Bureau to identify basic and necessary needs for additional jail bed capacity, we deferred our recommendation pending efforts by the other subcommittees in an attempt to remain at or under the \$119 million cap (see Memo, Jessica Rio, July 22, 2005). After receiving the reports of the other two subcommittees and identifying an additional \$3.5 million available to remain at the cap, the full committee voted to allocate this additional amount to the jail project.

Attachment C

Final Recommendation of Drainage & Mobility

August 12, 2005

The Hon. Samuel T. Biscoe
Commissioners of Travis County
The Travis County Commissioner's Court
314 W. 11th St., #520
Austin, TX 78701

Dear Sir,

The Committee on Mobility & Drainage, a sub committee of the 2005 Citizen's Bond Advisory Committee, has revised and completed its list of projects to recommend to The Court for the 2005 Bond Election. The list of projects was reported unanimously out of the sub committee and adopted unanimously by the full committee during its regularly scheduled meeting of August 9th, 2005.

In addition to the list, the full committee resolved that the set of guidelines pertaining to county participation in public/private partnerships adopted by the Court during its regular meeting of July 12th 2005, be embedded in the upcoming bond covenant.

Attached is the list of projects recommended by the committee.

In its consideration of projects pertaining to drainage and floodplain issues, the committee gave primary attention to projects that impacted public safety, in particular access by emergency vehicles.

In its consideration of projects pertaining to roads and bridges, the committee gave primary attention to projects serving existing populations.

At our final meeting of August 9th, the Committee was abruptly informed that certain administrative cost had been left out the original calculations and that further cuts, approaching ten percent, would now be necessary. The Cameron Road project, SH 130 to bridge 106, is a direct casualty of this readjustment. In the event that continued calculations by the Court are able

to better address this issue, the Committee commends the Cameron Road project for reconsideration.

We thank the Court and the citizens of Travis County for this opportunity to serve and for the privilege of working alongside the staff of Travis County Transportation and Natural Resources.

We wish you all the very best in the months ahead.

Sincerely,

Glen Coleman
Chairman, Sub Committee on Mobility and Drainage

**2005 Citizens Bond Advisory Committee
Final Project List of Recommendations
8-9-2005**

Mobility Projects

Pct. #	Project Name	Project Limits	CBAC Recom. 7/12/2005	Revised Costs 8/9/2005	CBAC Recommendation 8/9/2005
1,2	Howard Lane I	Dessau to Cameron Rd.	\$ 11,900,000	\$ 13,908,103	\$ 13,908,103
1	Howard Lane II *	COA limits to east of SH 130	\$ 4,753,476	\$ 6,732,252	\$ 6,732,252
1	Kimbro Rd./Parsons Rd. Bridge	Low Water Crossing Replacement	\$ 4,900,000	\$ 3,239,984	\$ 3,239,984
1	Wells Branch Pkwy. *	Boulder Ridge sub to Cameron Rd.	\$ 1,632,006	\$ 2,778,590	\$ 2,778,590
1,2	Cameron Rd.	SH 130 to Bridge 106	\$ 8,330,000	\$ 8,925,553	\$ -
2	Gattis School Rd.	CR 122 to east of Huntington Trails sub.	\$ 6,975,965	\$ 6,705,399	\$ 6,705,399
2	Jesse Bohls Rd. Bridge #231	At Wilbarger Creek	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,832,704	\$ 1,832,704
2	Pecan Street*	Pflugerville limits to SH 130	\$ 4,657,700	\$ 3,714,430	\$ 3,714,430
3	Reimers-Peacock Rd. (Prelim. Eng./ROW)*	Hamilton Pool Rd. to SH 71	\$ 600,000	\$ 825,268	\$ -
3	Hamilton Pool Rd. I (Design Only)	RM 12 to Reimers-Peacock Rd.	\$ 404,219	\$ 419,071	\$ 419,071
3	Hamilton Pool Rd. II (Design Only)	Reimers-Peacock Rd. to Pedernales River	\$ 562,051	\$ 578,546	\$ 578,546
3	FM 1431 (Right-of-Way Only)	Trails End area re-alignment	\$ 240,000	\$ 240,000	\$ 240,000
3	FM 1626 (Right-of-Way Only)	Hays County line to Brodie Lane	\$ 160,000	\$ 160,000	\$ 160,000
3	FM 1826 (Right-of-Way Only)	US 290 W to Slaughter Lane	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
3	FM 2244 (Right-of-Way Only)	Unincorporated sections	\$ 325,000	\$ 325,000	\$ 325,000
4	Slaughter Ln. I*	Bluff Springs Rd. to McKinney Falls Pkwy.	\$ 7,795,676	\$ 6,234,730	\$ 6,234,730
Total for Mobility Projects:			\$ 54,476,093	\$ 56,669,630	\$ 46,918,809

Drainage/Flood Plain Buyout Projects

Pct. #	Project Name	CBAC Recom. 7/12/2005	Revised Costs 8/9/2005	CBAC Recommendation 8/9/2005
1	Imperial Valley Drive (Drainage Project)	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,977,536	\$ 1,977,536
1	Quiette Drive/Walnut Creek Drainage	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,810,000	\$ 1,810,000
3	Twin Creeks Arroyo Doble (Buyout of 4 homes)	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000
4	Thoroughbred Farms (Buyout 12 homes)	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,442,140	\$ 1,442,140
4	Caldwell Lane/Garfield Water Supply	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
4	Timber Creek Subdivision (Buyout)	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 3,300,000
Total for Drainage/Flood Plain Buyout:		\$ 9,300,000	\$ 9,629,676	\$ 9,629,676

Parks and Open Space Projects

Pct. #	Project Name	CBAC Recom. 7/12/2005	Revised Costs 8/9/2005	CBAC Recommendation 8/9/2005
1	East Metro Park (Phase 2)	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 7,080,000	\$ 7,080,000
2	Northeast Metro Park (Phase 3)	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 3,998,200	\$ 3,998,200
3	Arkansas Bend Park Improvements	\$ 6,300,000	\$ 7,424,100	\$ 3,375,100
3	Southwest Metro Park (Phase 2)	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 14,404,700	\$ 14,404,700
3	Water Quality Protection Agreements	\$ 3,400,000	\$ 7,286,000	\$ 7,286,000
4	Southeast Metro Park Confluence Trail*	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 3,310,200	\$ 3,310,200
Total for Parks and Open Space:		\$ 30,500,000	\$ 43,503,200	\$ 39,454,200

Total for Mobility/Drainage-Flood Plain/Parks and Open Space	\$ 94,276,093	\$ 109,802,506	\$ 96,002,685
---	----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Jail Facility Improvement Projects

Total for Jail Facility Improvements:	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 23,500,000
--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Total:	\$ 114,276,093	\$ 129,802,506	\$ 119,502,685
---------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Total for Open Space Proposition:	\$ 60,000,000	\$ 60,000,000	\$ 60,000,000
--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Grand Total 2005 Bond:	\$ 174,276,093	\$ 189,802,506	\$ 179,502,685
-------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, makes any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accepts no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Attachment C

Parks and Open Space Subcommittee Report

The Parks and Open Space Subcommittee are in agreement on the following project recommendations, including the proposed project budgets and their prioritization. We recommend the following:

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------|
| A. | 1. SW Metro Park: Reimers Ranch Land acquisition and development of the park both environmentally and recreationally. The management and preservation of this land is of utmost importance for now and future generations. | \$14,404,700 |
| | 2. East Metro Park: Complete Phase II. This park is becoming one of the best in the county and state. Serving a quickly growing population. | \$7,000,800 |
| | 3. Arkansas Bend: Development of day use. Emphasizing management and safety. | \$3,375,100 |
| | 4. NE Metro Park: Complete Phase III, including a first class skate park facility. This park also is serving a growing population. Another first class park. | \$3,998,200 |
| | 5. SE Metro. An opportunity for a partnership with land acquisition and continue with park upgrades including access to the river with boat ramps. Preserving the additional open land for future use. | \$3,310,200 |
| | 6. Water Quality. Hogue/Pogue Springs/Reimers Land | <u>\$7,286,000</u> |
| | Total | <u>\$39,454,200</u> |
| B. | Purchase of Natural Areas: The Citizens bond committee recommends that a stand alone proposition to purchase natural areas be put on the upcoming bond election. The purpose of purchasing such natural areas is to protect the water quality of the Colorado River, Lake Travis, area creeks and streams, the aquifer, provide refuge for wildlife and to provide for limited public use. The amount of the bond proposition is proposed to be \$60 million, which is a one cent tax increase (one cent per \$100 in property value), amounting to an estimated \$16 per year for an average household. Very recent polling of Travis County voters has indicated that, by a factor of 2 to 1, voters favor such a proposition and are most comfortable when 1) an advisory panel of citizens is involved in the spending of the money, and, 2) voters are told how much the proposition will cost them. | |
| | Total | <u>\$60,000,000</u> |

GUIDELINES FOR COUNTY PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS FOR ARTERIAL ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION (Adopted July 12, 2005)

PRINCIPLES

- The purpose of the program is to improve mobility. The candidate project shall be a planned arterial within the adopted CAMPO long-range transportation plan.
- The candidate project shall be within the unincorporated area of Travis County and outside the "near term annexation area" of the City of Austin as defined in 30-1-21(50) of the Austin-Travis County Subdivision Regulations or a 3-year annexation plan adopted by a municipality to be eligible for county financial participation.
- The completed project shall result in a minimum viable segment of roadway, fully functional and usable by the public if no subsequent phase or segment is constructed in the future, and shall connect to a publicly maintained roadway.
- Within municipal extraterritorial jurisdictions, the terms and conditions of the public/private partnership agreement shall be consistent with subdivision regulations jointly adopted by a city and the county, or the county's subdivision regulations if no joint code exists.
- County financial participation is contingent upon approval by the citizens of bond funds for the project or by funds otherwise approved by the Commissioners Court.
- All parties and controlling interests within the limits of the minimum viable segment of roadway shall agree to the basic requirements below before the County Attorney initiates contract development.

BASIC REQUIREMENTS

- From land they control, the participating private parties shall donate to the county all rights of way, drainage easements, and land for all necessary road-related storm water capture and transmission facilities and detention and water quality ponds necessary for the project. At its discretion, the county may use its power of eminent domain to acquire out parcels.
- Private parties shall pay their proportionate share of engineering and construction cost, but not less than half of the cost of a four-lane divided arterial roadway. Proportionate share is defined as the total number of vehicle miles of travel generated by a preliminary subdivision plan of the parent tract(s) divided by the CAMPO forecasted increment of total vehicle miles of travel within the quadrant of the county where the private properties are located, multiplied by the total cost of the planned, added arterial capacity within the quadrant.
- Construction cost shall include bridges, utility relocation, road-related storm water detention and water quality ponds, landscaping, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and any cost increase or change order reasonably necessary to complete the project.
- The parties shall make available their proportionate share of engineering design cost prior to the execution of a professional services agreement. The private parties shall dedicate all right of way and easements and post fiscal security for the full amount of the private sector's proportionate share of construction cost prior to the award of bid.
- Construction will be competitively bid whether done by the private or public sector.
- The County shall define the project engineering design standards; define and approve the scope and terms of the engineering contracts, including the amount and coverage of professional errors and omissions insurance; and review and approve the engineering construction plans and specifications.
- A private party who disagrees with a decision made by the Executive Manager under these guidelines may appeal that decision to the Travis County Commissioners Court.