

**AGENDA ITEM 29**

Discuss and take any appropriate action on Juvenile Academy property.

No action was taken on this agenda item.

**AGENDA ITEM 30**

Discuss and take any appropriate action on road bond program.

Mike Weaver discussed road bond issues and distributed a handout on utility relocation.

Pete Peters gave the commissioners an update on a newsletter for distribution via the Austin American-Statesman concerning county road construction.

No action was taken on this agenda item.

< Attachment >

**Williamson County Statement of Qualifications  
Utility Coordination and Relocation**

<b>Company</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Fax</b>	<b>Contact</b>
S.D. Kallman, L.P.	1106 South Mays, Ste. 100 Round Rock, Texas 78664	218-4404	218-1668	Steven D. Kallman, P.E.
Martinez, Wright & Mendez	1106 Clayton Lane, Ste. 400W Austin, Texas 78723	453-0767	453-1734	Roberto O. Martinez, P.E.
Pate Engineers	9430 Research Blvd., Ste. IV-110 Austin, Texas 78759	340-0600	340-0604	David Hamilton, P.E.
Urban Design Group	3660 Stoneridge Rd., Ste. E-101 Austin, Texas 78746	347-0040	347-1311	Laura L. Toups, P.E.
Gray Jansing & Associates	8217 Shoal Creek Blvd., Ste. 200 Austin, Texas 78757	452-0371	454-9933	John Jansing, P.E.
HDR	2211 South IH-35, Ste. 300 Austin, Texas	912-5100	912-5158	Adrian Huckabee, P.E.
Cobb, Fendley & Assoc.	8000 Centre Park Dr., Ste. 370 Austin, Texas 78754-5136	834-9798	834-9553	Allen D. Watson, P.E.
Randall Jones Engineering, Inc.	1212 E. Braker Lane Austin, Texas 78753	836-4793	836-4817	Mike Mayhew, P.E.
JNS Consulting Engineers, Inc.	611 S. Congress Ave., Ste. 330 Austin, Texas 78704	416-9990	416-6097	Jon Strange, P.E.
TBE Group/PBS&J	9027 Northgate Blvd., Ste. 141 Austin, Texas 78758	836-1103	(972) 682-5603	John Harter, P.E.
Baker-Aicklen	203 E. Main St., Ste. 201 Round Rock, Texas 78664	244-9620	244-9623	A. William Waeltz, P.E.
Malone/Wheeler, Inc.	5316 Highway 290 West, Ste. 150 Austin, Texas 78735	899-0601	899-0655	Richard Wheeler, P.E.
Carter & Burgess	901 S. Mopac Expwy., Ste. 200 Austin, Texas 78746	314-3100	314-3135	Mitt Tidwell, P.E.
Doucet & Associates, Inc.	5121 Bee Caves Rd., Ste. 201 Austin, Texas 78746	583-2600	583-2601	William Friedrich, P.E.
Cuatro Consultants, Ltd.	320 N. Main, Ste. 202 Buda, Texas 78610	295-8052	295-8241	Hugo Elizondo, P.E.
Cunningham-Allen, Inc.	3103 Bee Cave Rd., Ste. 202 Austin, Texas 78746	327-2946	327-2973	Freddie Dippel, P.E.

05/22/2001

Company	Address	Phone	Fax	Contact
Howard Engineers, Inc.	4303 Russell Dr. Austin, Texas 78704	448-0881	448-0989	Charles Howard, P.E.
Haft Associates	8616 Northwest Plaza Dr. Dallas, Texas 75225	(214) 346-6200	(214) 739-0095	George Prall, P.E.
Turner Collier & Braden, Inc.	400 W. 15th St, Ste. 500 Austin, Texas 78701	472-4519	472-7519	David Disckind, P.E.

## TTI 2001 Urban Mobility Report Summary

The Texas Transportation Institute's 2001 Urban Mobility Report, released May 7, indicates that urban traffic problems nationwide are on the rise, with increasing traffic demands ill-served by transportation networks that have not expanded at the same rate. The report, which can be reviewed in entirety at <http://mobility.tamu.edu/>, details the study of congestion levels of major road systems in 68 U.S. urban areas.

The study concludes that:

- ♦ Congestion is growing in areas of every size.
- ♦ Congestion costs are increasing in every aspect. Congestion costs for 1999 were \$78 billion for the 68 areas in this study, which includes 4.5 billion hours of delay and 6.8 gallons of excess fuel consumed.
- ♦ Road expansions slow the growth of congestion. Where the rate of roadway expansions increased at the same rate as travel growth, travel time grew about one-fourth to one-third as fast than areas where traffic volume exceeded road expansion.
- ♦ Road expansion alone will probably not be the solution to mobility problems in most of the studied cities. A set of improvements will be required.

On average, mobility is not improving in the areas studied. Congested periods are getting longer, more traffic is subject to congested conditions, and trip time during congested periods is increasing. The TTI report illustrates the need for recognition of these trends, particularly in light of the amount of time required to put major projects and programs into place.

### *Where does Austin stand?*

It comes as no surprise that Austin reflects and, in some cases, magnifies these conclusions. In a situation where ranking high is akin to winning a race of who is going to hell in a hand basket the fastest, Austin is near the top in most categories overall and especially high in comparison to peer cities.

The study breaks the 68 areas into four population segments: very large (over 3,000,000), large (1-3,000,000), medium (500,000 – 1,000,000), and small (less than 500,000). Austin is considered a medium-sized city, in the company of Memphis, Jacksonville, and Albuquerque, among others. Other Texas cities in the study include: Houston (very large); Dallas, Ft. Worth, and San Antonio, (large); El Paso (medium); and Corpus Christi, Laredo, Beaumont and Brownsville (small).

In terms of the total magnitude of congestion, Austin generally fell in the middle of the 68 areas studied. However, once population values were calculated, the true magnitude of Austin's mobility problems is revealed. Austin ranked higher than every other medium size city (with one exception) and frequently ranked higher than many very large and large cities in terms of the Travel Rate Index (TRI), the Time Travel Index (TTI), delays per person, excess fuel consumed per person, and cost of congestion per person.

---

## **CATC's Response**

Considering Austin's poor showing in comparison to not only our peer group cities, but also to urban areas nationwide of every size, the Capital Area is clearly behind in our roadway infrastructure. We are fast approaching, and in some cases have already surpassed, the mobility problems of many large cities that are infamous for their transportation inadequacies.

TTI's study validates the same conclusions for overall urban mobility solutions that CATC has advocated since its inception for the Capital Area. CATC's very creation was in response to the recognition that congestion in the Capital Area has been rising which has subsequently incurred increasing costs for employers and, in turn, their employees.

CATC has long recommended an approach that achieves a multimodal, cost-effective transportation network for the entire community, conclusions that the 2001 Urban Mobility Report also reached:

- ♦ Expanding our deficient roadway system is a major component of slowing congestion. The TTI study estimates that Austin currently has an annual deficiency of 19 freeway and a 21 principal arterial street (PAS) lane-miles. At an average annual vehicle miles traveled growth rate of 4.1%, the study estimates that the Capital Area needs to build 23 freeway lane miles and 30 PAS lane miles annually *just to prevent congestion growth*.
- ♦ Roads alone are not the answer, due to both fiscal and physical constraints. Remedies must include more roads and transit (both new systems and expansion of existing systems), increased efficiency of operations through information technology and intelligent transportation systems, accommodation of the way travelers use the transportation network, and improving the reliability of transportation systems through management of the systems.

### ***The Solution:***

- ♦ **Increasing Funding:** CATC works with local, state and federal entities to expand the limited funding revenues for transportation.
- ♦ **Multimodal Remedies:** CATC continues to develop a 10-Year Transportation Plan that addresses many of these issues by maximizing our resources, while increasing freight and passenger mobility, and reducing air pollution. Elements of the 10-year Plan include major new roads and expansion of existing roadways, incident and congestion management systems, managed lanes (HOV / HOT), and light rail, commuter rail, and other advanced technologies.
- ♦ **Complementary solutions:** CATC is currently working with the Austin-San Antonio Corridor Council to seek funding and approval from local and federal sources for a freight transportation and logistics study. The freight study will include identification of freight rail, trucking, warehousing, and just-in-time delivery issues, and development of a designated freight corridor that will alleviate congestion by removing some of the freight traffic from highway routes.

### ***Another Perspective***

Randal O'Toole, of The Thoreau Institute and author of *The Vanishing Automobile and Other Urban Myths*, maintains a regular update series to this book that is available on-line. This month's update, entitled "Increased Congestion and What to Do About It" includes a critique of the TTI study and of the Surface Transportation Policy Project's response. Mr. O'Toole's update is available at:  
<http://www.ti.org/vaupdate13.html>.

---

## HOW AUSTIN RANKS IN THE TTI STUDY

**Travel Rate Index (TRI)** – measures the amount of additional time needed to make a trip during a “normally congested” peak travel period rather than at other times of the day

**Overall Average: 1.32**

**Medium City Average: 1.18**

**Austin: 1.25**

**Austin Rank: # 26 (2<sup>nd</sup> highest med. city)**

- ♦ **Austin clocks in at 1.25**, less than the overall average, but higher than all other medium-sized cities except Tacoma, WA, which has a TRI of 1.27. Austin’s TRI was closer to the large city average of 1.28.
- ♦ **Ranking at #26**, Austin’s TRI is the same as Baltimore and Indianapolis, and higher than Orlando, Milwaukee, New Orleans, Cleveland, Ft. Worth, Kansas City, and Pittsburgh – all of which have populations of more than 1,000,000.

**Travel Time Index (TTI)** – comparison of total travel time in the peak to travel time in free flow conditions

**Overall Average: 1.58**

**Medium City Average: 1.33**

**Austin: 1.47**

**Austin Rank: # 21 (Highest med. city)**

- ♦ **Austin’s TRI is 1.47** – again, smaller than the overall average, but considerably higher than the medium city average and closer to the large city average of 1.48.
- ♦ **At #21**, Austin is the highest ranked medium-size city, equivalent to Dallas and Cincinnati, and higher than Ft Lauderdale and St. Louis, in addition to the other large cities Austin topped for the TRI.

**Annual Delays per person (hours)**

**Overall Average: 36**

**Medium City Average: 26**

**Austin: 45 hours**

**Austin Rank: #7 (Highest medium city)**

- ♦ **Austin has an astounding 45 hours of delay per person**, well over both the overall average of 34 hours, and greater than the averages in all four size categories: very large – 41, large – 34, medium – 26, and small – 10.
- ♦ Broken down, in 1999 Austin had 12,625,000 recurring and 16,825,000 incident person-hours of delay, resulting in a middle-of-the-road ranking of **#35 in terms of number of hours**.
- ♦ However, factoring in Austin’s population, 45 annual hours of delay per person made **Austin the #7 ranked city overall**, exceeded only by super-size cities Los Angeles, Seattle, Wash., DC, Atlanta, Houston, and Dallas.
- ♦ Annual hours of delay in Austin have **more than quadrupled since 1982** (an average of 9 hours per person), and **doubled since 1992**(estimated at 22 hours per person).

---

**Annual Million Gallons of Fuel Wasted in 1999**
**Overall Average: 100****Medium City Average: 28                      Austin: 48                      Austin Rank: #33 (2<sup>nd</sup> highest med. city)****Annual Excess Fuel Consumed per person (gallons) in 1999****Overall Average: 55****Medium City Average: 39                      Austin: 71                      Austin Rank: #5 (Highest med. city)**


---

Noticing a pattern yet?

- With 48 million gallons of excess fuel wasted in 1999, **Austin again ranked near the middle in terms of overall numbers at #33**. Even so, this was considerably greater than the medium city average of 28 million gallons.
- Even more incredible, was the result after factoring in population. Austin's traffic delays created an enormous average of **71 gallons per person**, greater than the overall average of 55, and the average of all four size categories: very large – 62, large – 52, medium 39, and small – 14.
- Once again the highest-ranked medium city, **Austin is 5<sup>th</sup> in excess fuel consumed per person**, topped only by Los Angeles, Atlanta, Seattle, and Houston.

---

**Costs Due to Congestion (\$ millions) in 1999 (includes costs due to delay and wasted fuel)**
**Overall Average: \$1,145 M****Medium City Average: \$315 M                      Austin: \$510 M                      Austin Rank: #34 (3<sup>rd</sup> highest med. city)****Annual Cost of Congestion per person****Overall Average: \$625****Medium City Average: \$445                      Austin: \$785                      Austin Rank: #5 (Highest med. city)**


---

Play it again, Sam.

- **Austin's \$510 million cost due to congestion ranked in the middle at #34**, significantly higher than the medium city average of \$315 million.
  - Factor in the population, and guess what? Once again, Austin beats out every other medium-size city with a whopping **\$785 per person**. Yet again, this is greater than the overall average, and every size category: very large - \$710, large - \$590, medium - \$445, and small - \$170.
  - **Austin also ranks 5<sup>th</sup> in terms of annual cost per person**, with the other big four – Los Angeles, Seattle, Atlanta, and Houston, the only cities with higher per person costs. Austin's congestion cost per person is greater than Wash. DC, Dallas, and San Francisco.
-

---

## TTI 2001 Urban Mobility Report Summary

---

The Texas Transportation Institute's 2001 Urban Mobility Report, released May 7, indicates that urban traffic problems nationwide are on the rise, with increasing traffic demands ill-served by transportation networks that have not expanded at the same rate. The report, which can be reviewed in entirety at <http://mobility.tamu.edu/>, details the study of congestion levels of major road systems in 68 U.S. urban areas.

The study concludes that:

- ♦ Congestion is growing in areas of every size.
- ♦ Congestion costs are increasing in every aspect. Congestion costs for 1999 were \$78 billion for the 68 areas in this study, which includes 4.5 billion hours of delay and 6.8 gallons of excess fuel consumed.
- ♦ Road expansions slow the growth of congestion. Where the rate of roadway expansions increased at the same rate as travel growth, travel time grew about one-fourth to one-third as fast than areas where traffic volume exceeded road expansion.
- ♦ Road expansion alone will probably not be the solution to mobility problems in most of the studied cities. A set of improvements will be required.

On average, mobility is not improving in the areas studied. Congested periods are getting longer, more traffic is subject to congested conditions, and trip time during congested periods is increasing. The TTI report illustrates the need for recognition of these trends, particularly in light of the amount of time required to put major projects and programs into place.

### ***Where does Austin stand?***

It comes as no surprise that Austin reflects and, in some cases, magnifies these conclusions. In a situation where ranking high is akin to winning a race of who is going to hell in a hand basket the fastest, Austin is near the top in most categories overall and especially high in comparison to peer cities.

The study breaks the 68 areas into four population segments: very large (over 3,000,000), large (1-3,000,000), medium (500,000 – 1,000,000), and small (less than 500,000). Austin is considered a medium-sized city, in the company of Memphis, Jacksonville, and Albuquerque, among others. Other Texas cities in the study include: Houston (very large); Dallas, Ft. Worth, and San Antonio, (large); El Paso (medium); and Corpus Christi, Laredo, Beaumont and Brownsville (small).

In terms of the total magnitude of congestion, Austin generally fell in the middle of the 68 areas studied. However, once population values were calculated, the true magnitude of Austin's mobility problems is revealed. Austin ranked higher than every other medium size city (with one exception) and frequently ranked higher than many very large and large cities in terms of the Travel Rate Index (TRI), the Time Travel Index (TTI), delays per person, excess fuel consumed per person, and cost of congestion per person.

---



## CATC's Response

Considering Austin's poor showing in comparison to not only our peer group cities, but also to urban areas nationwide of every size, the Capital Area is clearly behind in our roadway infrastructure. We are fast approaching, and in some cases have already surpassed, the mobility problems of many large cities that are infamous for their transportation inadequacies.

TTI's study validates the same conclusions for overall urban mobility solutions that CATC has advocated since its inception for the Capital Area. CATC's very creation was in response to the recognition that congestion in the Capital Area has been rising which has subsequently incurred increasing costs for employers and, in turn, their employees.

CATC has long recommended an approach that achieves a multimodal, cost-effective transportation network for the entire community, conclusions that the 2001 Urban Mobility Report also reached:

- ♦ Expanding our deficient roadway system is a major component of slowing congestion. The TTI study estimates that Austin currently has an annual deficiency of 19 freeway and a 21 principal arterial street (PAS) lane-miles. At an average annual vehicle miles traveled growth rate of 4.1%, the study estimates that the Capital Area needs to build 23 freeway lane miles and 30 PAS lane miles annually *just to prevent congestion growth*.
- ♦ Roads alone are not the answer, due to both fiscal and physical constraints. Remedies must include more roads and transit (both new systems and expansion of existing systems), increased efficiency of operations through information technology and intelligent transportation systems, accommodation of the way travelers use the transportation network, and improving the reliability of transportation systems through management of the systems.

### *The Solution:*

- ♦ **Increasing Funding:** CATC works with local, state and federal entities to expand the limited funding revenues for transportation.
- ♦ **Multimodal Remedies:** CATC continues to develop a 10-Year Transportation Plan that addresses many of these issues by maximizing our resources, while increasing freight and passenger mobility, and reducing air pollution. Elements of the 10-year Plan include major new roads and expansion of existing roadways, incident and congestion management systems, managed lanes (HOV / HOT), and light rail, commuter rail, and other advanced technologies.
- ♦ **Complementary solutions:** CATC is currently working with the Austin-San Antonio Corridor Council to seek funding and approval from local and federal sources for a freight transportation and logistics study. The freight study will include identification of freight rail, trucking, warehousing, and just-in-time delivery issues, and development of a designated freight corridor that will alleviate congestion by removing some of the freight traffic from highway routes.

### *Another Perspective*

Randal O'Toole, of The Thoreau Institute and author of *The Vanishing Automobile and Other Urban Myths*, maintains a regular update series to this book that is available on-line. This month's update, entitled "Increased Congestion and What to Do About It" includes a critique of the TTI study and of the Surface Transportation Policy Project's response. Mr. O'Toole's update is available at: <http://www.ti.org/vaupdate13.html>.

---

## HOW AUSTIN RANKS IN THE TTI STUDY

**Travel Rate Index (TRI)** – measures the amount of additional time needed to make a trip during a “normally congested” peak travel period rather than at other times of the day

**Overall Average: 1.32**

**Medium City Average: 1.18**

**Austin: 1.25**

**Austin Rank: # 26 (2<sup>nd</sup> highest med. city)**

- Austin clocks in at 1.25, less than the overall average, but higher than all other medium-sized cities except Tacoma, WA, which has a TRI of 1.27. Austin’s TRI was closer to the large city average of 1.28.
- **Ranking at #26**, Austin’s TRI is the same as Baltimore and Indianapolis, and higher than Orlando, Milwaukee, New Orleans, Cleveland, Ft. Worth, Kansas City, and Pittsburgh – all of which have populations of more than 1,000,000.

**Travel Time Index (TTI)** – comparison of total travel time in the peak to travel time in free flow conditions

**Overall Average: 1.58**

**Medium City Average: 1.33**

**Austin: 1.47**

**Austin Rank: # 21 (Highest med. city)**

- Austin’s TRI is 1.47 – again, smaller than the overall average, but considerably higher than the medium city average and closer to the large city average of 1.48.
- **At #21**, Austin is the highest ranked medium-size city, equivalent to Dallas and Cincinnati, and higher than Ft Lauderdale and St. Louis, in addition to the other large cities Austin topped for the TRI.

**Annual Delays per person (hours)**

**Overall Average: 36**

**Medium City Average: 26**

**Austin: 45 hours**

**Austin Rank: #7 (Highest medium city)**

- Austin has an astounding 45 hours of delay per person, well over both the overall average of 34 hours, and greater than the averages in all four size categories: very large – 41, large – 34, medium – 26, and small – 10.
- Broken down, in 1999 Austin had 12,625,000 recurring and 16,825,000 incident person-hours of delay, resulting in a middle-of-the-road ranking of **#35 in terms of number of hours**.
- However, factoring in Austin’s population, 45 annual hours of delay per person made **Austin the #7 ranked city overall**, exceeded only by super-size cities Los Angeles, Seattle, Wash., DC, Atlanta, Houston, and Dallas.
- Annual hours of delay in Austin have **more than quadrupled since 1982** (an average of 9 hours per person), and **doubled since 1992**(estimated at 22 hours per person).

---

**Annual Million Gallons of Fuel Wasted in 1999**
**Overall Average: 100****Medium City Average: 28                      Austin: 48                      Austin Rank: #33 (2<sup>nd</sup> highest med. city)****Annual Excess Fuel Consumed per person (gallons) in 1999****Overall Average: 55****Medium City Average: 39                      Austin: 71                      Austin Rank: #5 (Highest med. city)**


---

Noticing a pattern yet?

- With 48 million gallons of excess fuel wasted in 1999, **Austin again ranked near the middle in terms of overall numbers at #33**. Even so, this was considerably greater than the medium city average of 28 million gallons.
- Even more incredible, was the result after factoring in population. Austin's traffic delays created an enormous average of **71 gallons per person**, greater than the overall average of 55, and the average of all four size categories: very large – 62, large – 52, medium 39, and small – 14.
- Once again the highest-ranked medium city, **Austin is 5<sup>th</sup> in excess fuel consumed per person**, topped only by Los Angeles, Atlanta, Seattle, and Houston.

---

**Costs Due to Congestion (\$ millions) in 1999 (includes costs due to delay and wasted fuel)**
**Overall Average: \$1,145 M****Medium City Average: \$315 M                      Austin: \$510 M                      Austin Rank: #34 (3<sup>rd</sup> highest med. city)****Annual Cost of Congestion per person****Overall Average: \$625****Medium City Average: \$445                      Austin: \$785                      Austin Rank: #5 (Highest med. city)**


---

Play it again, Sam.

- **Austin's \$510 million cost due to congestion ranked in the middle at #34**, significantly higher than the medium city average of \$315 million.
  - Factor in the population, and guess what? Once again, Austin beats out every other medium-size city with a whopping **\$785 per person**. Yet again, this is greater than the overall average, and every size category: very large - \$710, large - \$590, medium - \$445, and small - \$170.
  - **Austin also ranks 5<sup>th</sup> in terms of annual cost per person**, with the other big four – Los Angeles, Seattle, Atlanta, and Houston, the only cities with higher per person costs. Austin's congestion cost per person is greater than Wash. DC, Dallas, and San Francisco.
-

**AGENDA ITEM 31**

**Comments from commissioners.**

There were no comments from the commissioners.

Joe Latteo, Maintenance Director, gave an update on maintenance issues.

**COMMISSIONERS' COURT ADJOURNED AT 11:15 A.M. ON TUESDAY, MAY 22, 2001.**

THE FOREGOING MINUTES recorded on Minutes Pages 1 through 126, inclusive had at a Special Session of Commissioners' Court of Williamson County, Texas, having been read are hereby approved this 29th day of May, 2001.



John C. Doerfler, County Judge

ATTEST: Nancy E. Rister, Clerk County Court & Ex-officio Clerk,  
Commissioners' Court, Williamson County, Texas

By:   
Deputy Clerk