

**Capital Area Regional Transportation Planning Organization  
CARTPO**

**Summary Minutes**

**CAPCOG Board Room  
2520 South IH 35, Suite 100  
Austin, TX  
Friday, June 10, 2005**

**PARTICIPANTS:**

Alderman Bill Hamilton, City of Rollingwood  
Commissioner Maurice Pitts, Lee County  
Councilmember Karl Ansbach, City of Lakeway  
Commissioner Wayne Brascom, Llano County  
Commissioner Ronny Hibler, Burnet County  
Commissioner Susie Carter, Hays County  
Ed Collins, TxDOT  
Joe Holland, TxDOT  
Bruce Byron, CATC  
Mayor Eric Carlson, City of Elgin  
Travis Askey, Village of Bee Cave  
Howard Falkenberg, AARO  
Jeremy Martin, Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce  
Sandy Hentges, Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce  
Patrick Marotta, TxDOT  
Jerry King

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Betty Voights, CAPCOG  
Sean Moran, CAPCOG  
Eric Dusza, CAPCOG  
Georgette Nugent, CAPCOG

**I. Call to Order – Alderman Bill Hamilton**

Alderman Hamilton opened meeting with an introduction of all.

**II. SH 130 Land Use Scenarios and Case Study Comparison – Jeremy Martin,  
Director, Governmental Relations, The Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce**

What we are hoping to accomplish with interest in SH 130 Corridor - Part of an effort to support our Regional Economic Development initiatives. Kicked off Opportunity Austin Campaign - \$14,000,000 economical development initiative with the goal to create

72,000 jobs in the Central Texas region over a five year period. 80 % of jobs come from existing businesses.

#### Background information of SH 130 -

- Part of Central Texas Turnpike Project including SH 45 North and Loop 1.
- Four lane toll road with limited frontage roads expected to open December 2007.
- Initial phase is 49 mile route from Georgetown to Mustang Ridge (183).
- If money is available, construction will begin to connect SH 130 to I-10 at Seguin.
- Focus of much planning discussion as part of Envision Central Texas, and site of future economic development activities.
- Majority of SH 130 route lies outside of city jurisdictions, but within cities' extraterritorial jurisdictions.

#### SH 130 Project Scope – Purpose and goals we hope to achieve.

- Want to benchmark SH 130 with other case study cities such as Dallas, Houston and Denver.
- Provide information to elected leaders, public sector officials, and general public.
- Research benchmark cities and analyze their best practices and lessons learned.
- Develop Land Use Scenarios depicting various development patterns based on actual benchmark examples.

\*This is neither a land use nor transportation planning study, an economic impact study, or a public policy position nor resolution.\*

#### Land Use Scenarios Used for Benchmarking –

- High Intensity: High Commercial, Low Residential
- Medium Intensity: Mixed Commercial and Residential
- Low Intensity: Low Commercial, High Residential (especially single-family)

Specific interest lies between 290 to the north and 71/183 to the south. Approved 2030 Plan – expansion from traditional center to the east. Looking ahead at how corridors are developed and extended will help facilitate development along 130 Corridor.

#### Developing Case Studies for Benchmark Cities –

- Found cities similar in development to Austin.
- Used in case studies – historic information, demographics, such as numbers and trends of the area.
- Making it possible to study how we can overcome any obstacles we may come across along the way.

#### Potential Project Outcomes –

- Land use policy discussions involving jurisdictions along SH 130 corridor.
- Coordinated land use planning efforts.
- Connectivity of arterials between I-35 and SH 130.
- Increased awareness of economic development opportunities along corridor.

Extended an invitation to an inner city visit to Denver to study toll roads in the first week of October.

Project timeline –

June – Initiate data gathering.

GIS Data for SH 130 and Case Study cities.

Interviews with public and commercial sector leaders in benchmark cities.

July - Develop drafts for case studies and solicit feedback on draft scenarios.

August - Finalize report on findings.

September - Present report to public.

It was questioned if the benchmark cities were an adequate comparison. Yes, Chamber is attempting to use cities and projects dating from 1990 and after.

**III. Discuss SB 873 County Land Use Controls / Major Thoroughfare Plan – Eric Dusza, Community Planner, CAPCOG**

The first step is to identify current transportation challenges. –

- Insufficient right-of-way such as the double-decked section of IH-35 or MOPAC.
- Funding needed for road repair, which we are all familiar with.
- Over designation of right-of-way, a good example might be the Trans-Texas Corridor.
- County land use controls.
- Uninformed citizens.
- Congestion and delays due to construction and insufficient roadway capacity.

\*There was a request to add education on transportation challenges.\*

The primary objective to help alleviate some of these challenges. -

- Inform citizens of future roadway development.
- Preservation of adequate right-of-way.
- Make efficient use of available resources.
- Minimize amount of land required for roadways.
- Identify the functional role of each street design.
- Minimize the negative impacts of street widening and construction by recognizing where, in the future, needed improvements are going to be needed.

Authorities granted under SB 873, which passed the 77<sup>th</sup> Legislation and became effective September 1, 2001, basically granted broader land use control of the county. It did so by expanding right-of-way dedication up to 120 feet in the Major Thoroughfare Plan. It also required minimal lot frontages, minimal set-backs, and allowed developers to contract with the county without complying with the competitive sealed bidding process.

Under the Major Thoroughfare Plan, the right-of way dedication of a major thoroughfare street can exceed 120 feet as long as the requirement is consistent with the transportation plan of the metropolitan planning organization.

Under SB 873, Williamson, Travis, Hays, Bastrop and Caldwell Counties are eligible to use these authorities because Travis County currently has a population of greater than 700,000 people and the remaining counties are located within the MSA. Following the 78<sup>th</sup> Legislation, the HB 1204 expanded on which counties could use these authorities by including Burnet and Blanco Counties because they had a population increase of over 40% from the 1990 to the 2000 census.

Under the NCTCOG Regional Thoroughfare Plan – Rockwall County and Johnson County have created their own Major Thoroughfare Plan within the North Central Texas COG.

Three major components to the Rockwall County Major Thoroughfare Plan

- Thoroughfare plan roadway recommendations – 2, 3, 4, and 6 lane facilities
- Functional classification of roadways – Freeways, Regional Arterials, and other Arterials.
- Geometric design standards for various types of roadway configurations – The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) published A Policy of Geometric Design of Highway and Streets which established minimum criteria and suggested guidelines.

Johnson County is only half contained in the MPO boundary. The major components are essentially the same as Rockwall County.

- Thoroughfare plan recommendations – right-of-way needs 60, 90, 120 foot ROW
- Functional classification of roadways – Freeways, Regional Arterials, and other Arterials.
- Geometric design standards for various types of roadway configurations – The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) published A Policy of Geometric Design of Highway and Streets which established minimum criteria and suggested guidelines.

Montgomery County is another example of a major thoroughfare plan but not from the Dallas area. It was located and completed by HGAC. (Dusza explained the legend).

The COG and CAMPO are beginning to talk about creating major thoroughfare plans with Caldwell and Bastrop Counties. These are only preliminary discussions. No decisions regarding funding or a timeline have been discussed.

A discussion followed the presentation.

**IV. Legislative Update – TxDOT Legislative Affairs Office – Patrick Marotta**

Please see “Omnibus Transportation Legislation – 79<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature” handout.

**V. Review CARTPO’s 2005 Call for Projects and Application Material – Alderman Bill Hamilton**

**Ed Collins, TxDOT –**

**Project Example**

\$3 million project cost  
2004 traffic count – 30,000  
Projected 2024 traffic – 55,000

**Cost Effectiveness**

**Example I**

$\frac{\text{Construction Cost}}{\text{Projected 2024 Traffic}} = \frac{\$3,000,000}{55,000} = \$54.55$  Representing dollars spent per trip.

(The lower the number the better the ranking)

**Example II**

Projected 2024 traffic	55,000
Subtract current 2004 traffic	- 30,000
Increased traffic	25,000

Annual value of traffic:  
25,000 x 365 days x \$5 = \$45,625,000

$\frac{\text{Annual value of increased traffic}}{\text{Construction cost}} = \frac{\$45,625,000}{\$3,000,000} = \$15.21$  of value for every construction dollar spent.

(The higher the number the better the ranking.)

**Safety**

Severity Index (SI) –  
The ratio of accidents involving an injury to total accidents.

Total Accidents - 202  
Total fatal & incapacitating injury accidents – 33

Severity Index (SI) = 33/202 = 0.163

**Standards Weight Consideration – Alderman Hamilton**

A group discussion was held to decide upon the 2005 Standards Weight (chart listed below). During discussion, Moran mentioned priorities listed by Bob Daigh at previous meeting – safety, maintenance, mobility. Upon completion of chart, Alderman Hamilton made a motion of approval and it was seconded by all.

2005 Standards Weight

STANDARD	WEIGHT
Local Support and/or Participation	1.5
Economic Development	0.75
Ease of Implementation	1
Regional Impact	1.5
Cost Effectiveness	1.25
Safety Considerations	1.5
Traffic Volumes	1.5

## **VI. Other Business**

It was decided there would be no meeting in July. Next meeting was set for August 12, 2005.