

AGENDA ITEM 18

Consider adopting amendments to the Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan.

Moved: Judge Doerfler  
Seconded: Commissioner Boatright  
Motion: To approve the amendments to the Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan.  
Vote: 4 - 0

< Attachment >

As of 7/8/02

Approved 8-6-02  
John C. Doerfler

Project	Limits	Proposed Change by Year			Existing Plan	Notes
		2007	2017	2027		
Avery Ranch Blvd/ O'Connor	US 183 to Parmer Ln	4	4	4	6	Already in Plan as Davis Springs Rd. (name change & # lane reduction)
	Parmer Ln to Great Oaks	4	4	4	4/6	
	Great Oaks to RM 620	4	4	4	4	
	RM 620 to Wyoming Springs	4	4	4	4	
	Wyoming Springs to McNeil	4	4	4		New segments
	McNeil to CR 172	4	4	4		
Brushy Creek Road (CR 174)	Great Oaks to Wyoming Springs	Remove			4	Environmental reasons (floodplain)
Chandler Road (CR 114)	FM 1460 to Arterial A	2	4	6	6	No change to Plan
	Arterial A to CR 110	2	4	6	6	
	CR 110 to SH 130	2	4	6		New segments
	SH 130 to FM 1660	2	4	6		
	FM 1660 to SH 95		2	4		
	SH 95 to FM 619		2	4		
CR 119	CR 164 (Hutto By-Pass) to US 79	2	4	4		New road being studied not in plan
CR 137	CR 138 to County Line	2	2	2		New segment.
CR 175	New Hope Dr. to FM 1431	4	4	4		New segment due to regional park.
CR 214	FM 1869 to SH 29	4	4	4		Not previously in plan. Based on recent studies.
	SH 29 to CR 214A	4	4	4		
	CR 214A to Rolling Hills Rd.	2	2	4		
CR 214A	CR 214 to FM 1869		2	4		New segment.
CR 273	CR 276 to FM 2243	2	2	2		
CR 276	Parmer Lane to CR 270			4		New east-west roadway.
	CR 270 to US 183	2	2	4		
	US 183 to Oak Grove	2	2	4		
	Oak Grove to Bagdad Rd.	2	2	4		
CR 300/301	FM 972 to FM 971	2	2	2	2	Change in limits.

Project	Limits	Proposed Change by Year			Existing Plan
		2007	2017	2027	
Georgetown Inner Loop (Shell Rd., Cedar Breaks, DB Woods)	SH 195 to FM 2338	2	2	4	2
	FM 2338 to SH 29	2	2	4	4
	SH 29 to FM 2243	2	2	4	4
	FM 2243 to IH 35		2	4	4
Georgetown Inner Loop East	IH 35 to SH 29	2	2	4	4
	SH 29 to FM 971	2	2	4	4
	FM 971 to IH 35	2	2	4	4
Great Oaks Drive	RM 620 to Wyoming Springs	4	4	4	4
Howard Lane	SH 45 to Lakeline Blvd.	Remove			6
	Lakeline Blvd. to Davis Springs Rd.				6
Hutto By-Pass	CR 110 to SH 130	2	4	4	
	SH 130 to CR 119	2	4	4	
	CR 119 to US 79	2	4	4	
Lakeline Blvd	N. Lake Creek Pkwy to Parmer Ln	4	4	4	6
	Parmer to Howard (Neenah Ave.)	4	4	4	6
	Howard to Great Oaks		4	4	6
Parmer Lane (CR 268) (Name change ?)	FM 1431 to FM 2243	4	4	4	6
	FM 2243 to SH 29	4	4	4	6
	SH 29 to FM 3405	2	2	4	6
	FM 3405 to FM 2338	2	2	4	6
	FM 2338 to SH 195		4	4	6
	SH 195 to IH 35			4	6
Wyoming Springs	FM 2243 to FM 1431		4	4	
	FM 1431 to Sam Bass	2	4	4	4
	Sam Bass to Creek Bend		4	4	4
	Creek Bend to RM 620	4	4	4	4
	RM 620 to Arterial C	4	4	4	4
	Arterial C to O'Connor	4	4	4	4
	O'Connor to Great Oaks	4	4	4	4
	Great Oaks to SH 45	4	4	4	4

**Proposed Changes to the  
Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan  
By Model Year (Open for Traffic)**

As of 7/8/02

Project		Limits	Proposed Change by Year			Existing Plan	Notes
			Number of Lanes			2025	
			2007	2017	2027	2025	
Avery Ranch Blvd/ O'Connor	US 183 to Parmer Ln		4	4	4	6	Already in Plan as Davis Springs Rd. (name change & # lane reduction)
	Parmer Ln to Great Oaks		4	4	4	4/6	
	Great Oaks to RM 620		4	4	4	4	
	RM 620 to Wyoming Springs		4	4	4	4	
	Wyoming Springs to McNeil		4	4	4		New segments
	McNeil to CR 172		4	4	4		
Brushy Creek Road (CR 174)		Great Oaks to Wyoming Springs	Remove			4	Environmental reasons (floodplain)
Chandler Road (CR 114)	FM 1460 to Arterial A		2	4	6	6	No change to Plan
	Arterial A to CR 110		2	4	6	6	
	CR 110 to SH 130		2	4	6		New segments
	SH 130 to FM 1660		2	4	6		
	FM 1660 to SH 95			2	4		
	SH 95 to FM 619			2	4		
CR 119	CR 164 (Hutto By-Pass) to US 79		2	4	4		New road being studied not in plan
CR 137	CR 138 to County Line		2	2	2		New segment.
CR 175	New Hope Dr. to FM 1431		4	4	4		New segment due to regional park.
CR 214	FM 1869 to SH 29		4	4	4		Not previously in plan. Based on recent studies.
	SH 29 to CR 214A		4	4	4		
	CR 214A to Rolling Hills Rd.		2	2	4		
CR 214A	CR 214 to FM 1869			2	4		
CR 273	CR 276 to FM 2243		2	2	2		
CR 276	Parmer Lane to CR 270				4		New east-west roadway.
	CR 270 to US 183		2	2	4		
	US 183 to Oak Grove		2	2	4		
	Oak Grove to Bagdad Rd.		2	2	4		
CR 300/301	FM 972 to FM 971		2	2	2	2	Change in limits.



**Public Meeting Comments--July 11 & 23, 2002**  
**(Proposed Amendments to the**  
**Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Meeting attended</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Zip</b>
Charles Shell (written comment)	Look at extending FM 1660 to FM 685 South of Hutto	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	6 W Naroma	Round Rock	78664
Charles Wagner (written comment)	Why are there no meetings scheduled east of Hutto? Are we going to find out later we are facing another proposal like Chandler Rd? Are we the forgotten half of Williamson County? I will not travel to your meetings, but I will keep watch on the media.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	4550 CR 417	Taylor	76574
unknown speaker (oral comment)	Why build 137 if it doesn't connect to anything in Travis county?	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8			
Doug Schernik (oral comment)	Concern about Chandler Road. Engineers and Williamson County does not know where road is going to go.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	5700 CR 101	Taylor	76574
Jim Vance (oral comment)	Has 25 + years experience in transportation. Traffic congestion is not a valid safety issue. "Experts" providing forecasted population information for Williamson County are biased. Make a presentation of forecasted population statistics available. This is a hidden program. I have no confidence in the underlying technical work that is supposed to justify the plan. It should be the intention to rebuild the face of the roads and the pavement structure so you can have a road that's decent.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	PO Box 352	Taylor	76574
unknown speaker (oral comment)	Why were the people on Chandler Road not given a public meeting? We sent a petition to the Commissioner's Court one year ago about setting that up.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8			

Carol Fox (oral comment)	What essentially is the purpose of these meetings? What will happen to our written comments? Will it in any way change what is going on? Does the county make decisions prior and without regard? Are we allowed to express our opinions just so the county can say we've heard everyone, or will there be a change because of what we say?	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	2301 CR 374	Taylor	76574
Jim Jirasek (oral comment)	My main concern is what is going to be done with the present roads and bridges we have. I think the voters expected some of the bond money to be used for existing roads and bridges.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	PO Box 1237	Taylor	76574
Jerry Mehevic (oral comment)	Request to up the total of the road bond to set aside some for the county roads. The roads that [the audience] is addressing tonight are all roads that need to be built with county money. As far as ethics and checking billing, I had a meeting in '96 ...and I couldn't figure out who was getting paid for what.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	5433 FM 619	Taylor	76574
Agnes Prutino (oral comment)	Bad, dangerous conditions of the lower route of CR 110 below 112 down to 79. The county should spend a little money to repair this road. Let's do first things first and worry about all the fancy roads next.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	200 Matthew Ln	Georgetown	78626
Louis Repa (oral comment)	There are 10 bridges [CRs] in the Austin area that are too dangerous for our school buses to go over. We should direct some of this bond money to these bridges...before these roads are developed. Use this money where its needed so our school buses can have roads, not on development.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8	3401 CR 327		
Avery Tucker (oral comment)	Mr. Limmer said he's very interested in doing what's right for Williamson County. But is he interested in doing what's right for Williamson County as long as he and some of his associates benefit?	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8			

unknown speaker (oral comment)	Fixing potholes was not the intent of the \$350 million program. Williamson County needs better roads. Somebody has got to step forward and start making some logical decisions. Cooperation is what will build roads.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8			
unknown speaker (oral comment)	You coming into CR 137 will make it more dangerous because you'll take another 10 feet and have 10 more feet of cars coming at you.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8			
unknown speaker (oral comment)	Prioritize lists and make them available for citizens. Some Austin engineers haven't even been to Williamson County. They are just lines on a map.	7/11/2002 Round Rock, 6-8			
**Residents of Leander submitted a petition to the Mayor and City Counsel of Leander opposing the proposed alignment of FM 2243 along CR 269. There were 77 signatures. (written comment)	<b>Petition Submitted to the City of Leander:</b> "... We oppose that part of the re-alignment of FM 2243 along the East-West part to CR 269. We believe: A. that it is un-necessary B. that it would be too expensive & disruptive to the residents C. that limited public resources...should be spent on other projects with higher priority D. that any widening or straightening necessary can be more efficiently and effectively accomplished contiguous to the existing FM 2243 right of way.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 10:30			
Linda Irvine Strong, Beulah G. Irvine, Louise Irvine Bradford (written comment)	We do not want to have any changes made to CR 143. This farm is our family business. Widening the road will be detrimental to business & will adversely affect the value of our land.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 10:30	1365 CR 143	Georgetown	78628
Louis Repa (oral comment)	Inquired about the alignment of CR 301, and said that he thought the map showing the alignment was wrong.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 10:30	3401 CR 327		

Jim Vance (oral comment)	In opposition to Chandler extension. The map handed out at this public hearing is different from the map at the hearing on July 11, 2002. No confidence in the underlying technical work done as a basis of the transportation plan. Does not believe that the population forecasts for the project were done by an independent firm with no interest in the project.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 10:30	PO Box 352	Taylor	76574
Hank Naizer (oral comment)	Against the extension of Chandler Road beyond FM 1460. Feels the bond issues are vaguely worded, and that many people believed that the bond issue would address repairs to existing county roads, rather than creating new roads. He expressed concern that the Chandler Road extension would impact the San Gabriel River	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 10:30	4701 Philco Dr	Austin	78745
Jim Jirasek (oral comment)	Lacks confidence in the road bond program. He feels there are other issues that need to be taken in to consideration along with roads, such as water issues. He believes that SH 29 could serve as a traffic corridor between the eastern and western portions of the county.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 10:30	PO Box 1237	Taylor	76574
Carol Fox (oral comment)	Opposed to the extension of Chandler Road past FM 1660. If a road is built in a particular area, growth will follow. While development adds to the tax base, it also adds to needed services. The American Farm Federation has found that farmland actually nets the county more tax dollars	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 10:30	2301 CR 374	Taylor	76574
Earlette McMin (oral comment)	Growth will come anyway, and it is better to plan for it. It will only cost more to attempt to address it after the fact.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 10:30	PO Box 158	Hutto	78634
Mr. & Mrs. Jim Van Artsdalen (oral comment)	Trees on property have not been considered. Engineers should come to property and look at the area before making decision. Barns can be rebuilt, but not trees.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 6-8	PO Box 2435	Brenham	77834



Ray Cowperthwaite (oral comment)	The citizens should be more informed. The purpose behind the specific roads should be more clear. Why are these roads needed? The population statistics should be made available to the public.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 6-8	2700 W. Pecan #310	Pflugerville	78660
unknown speaker (oral comment)	Where are engineers on 1431 and 1433? How were you able to plan right through my property without my knowledge of it? Why is Kitty Hill Airport given so much importance when it is so small?	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 6-8			
unknown speaker (oral comment)	Why has the change been made so that Parmer now veers to the Northwest?	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 6-8			
unknown speaker (oral comment)	Request for citizens to see a breakdown of remaining funds.	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 6-8			
unknown speaker (oral comment)	Desire to see map of proposed routes before they are "set in stone".	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 6-8			
unknown speaker (oral comment)	Deil announced there would be 'no more growth'. How does this effect the population forecasts?	7/23/2002 Georgetown, 6-8			

**Proposed Amendments to the  
Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan  
Dell Diamond-Meeting #1  
July 11, 2002**

\*This is the July 11, 2002 meeting on the Proposed Amendments to the Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan.

**Frankie Limmer:**

I guess we'll go ahead and get started. Looks like we've got a pretty good crowd here tonight. We have some maps up here we'd like you to look at. I want to go over Chandler Road first. I have another meeting I have to be at 7 o'clock, but I will cover that first along with the other propositions of Precinct 4, 137 just South of Williamson County line...[summary of areas in Precinct 4].

...We are going to stay on this route for Chandler Road. You look at right of way acquisition for 79. We are paying about \$4 per \_\_\_\_\_. You translate that to dollars and that's going to be about \$72000. For your grandchildren and my grandchildren, it doesn't make it their responsibility to buy that right of way...We can buy this area for somewhere around \$12000 and that makes a lot more sense than in 10 years going back down there and buying the same area for \$175000. If there are any questions, let's do them now while I'm here.

*Question & answer session continues with Commissioner Limmer... majority of discussion during this time is too muffled to decipher because people did not go to podium to speak into microphone.*

**Nancy Ledbetter:**

We're going to start with the Precinct 4 amendments. What we are proposing is a new segment for 137. This should be open by the year 2007.

**From Audience:** Where does 137 connect to Travis county?

CR 137 connects to Travis at Rowe Lane, and it stops there.

**From Audience:** So why do we build something down to the county line that doesn't go anywhere?

CR 137 right now comes all the way to Rowe Lane. I think there is some confusion on what the real intent of tonight's meeting is. We have a transportation plan that was adopted in 1999. This is just a long-range plan that identifies transportation needs. Since that time, we've had a bond election. We've had the population demographics forecast come out. And we've had new transportation modeling done. Based on all this information and very detailed preliminary engineering and environmental studies, we see the need to make some changes to this plan. So we have a road bond program, and we have the plan. The intent of this meeting tonight is to get all the roadways listed in our plan up to date with what currently is going on. So when I have on the table "new

segment" that means that there's a segment of the roadway that we're going to be improving that is not currently in the plan. But there is a roadway there already. We just need to get our plan more current. We are currently making improvements to CR 137 - we're doing some drainage, and making it a little bit wider because right now its less than 2 lanes. So are there any other questions on 137?

*[inaudible question]*

That is part of the road bond project. It is being upgraded from FM 1660 all the way down to the county line and Rowe Lane. And that's the road bond program. What I have proposed here is just to get that segment of roadway listed in our plan, which is not in there at this time.

*[inaudible question]*

You are talking about the segment that's between 1660 and South. That is in the road bond program. *[inaudible comment]* I think we're going to show that it is needed. *[inaudible comment]* Sir, I appreciate your comments. Tonight's format of this meeting is really to talk about the transportation plan amendments. We'll be happy to accept all your written comments, but we have the room until 8 o'clock, and I want to be able to cover all of these projects and give everyone equal time. So, if you could, written comments would be most helpful. The real format of this meeting is to present these amendments and then open it up for a comment period. So if we could...right now, I'm cutting off the comments. I'm going to get through my presentation, and then we'll have the official public hearing comment period.

*[Summary of Proposed Changes to the Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan--see handout]*

At this time, if anyone wants to speak to give a comment we have speaker cards. If you haven't filled one out and you'd like to speak, please fill one out. We don't have too many, so we won't use the timer.

#### **Comment Session**

##### **Speaker 1:**

I'm **Dover Schernik**, and I'm worried about Chandler Road...I'm on Chandler Road right now, and I know it's going to happen...You're not really sure where it's going to go...

##### **Speaker 2:**

My name is **Jim Vance**, and I live on 1331 east of \_\_\_\_\_. I'm a professional engineer with 25 plus years of experience in transportation. 19 years with the United States and several years in Asia and Africa.

First off, I want to say something regarding the comments that Commissioner Limmer made. He indicated that Chandler Road has always been in the plan. There was no county road before he became a commissioner, so for him to say that Chandler Road has always been there was a mistake, whether he realized it or not. The premise that traffic \_\_\_\_\_

congestion is a safety issue...is simply not valid. It represents a premise that has never been true for anywhere in the world. The shame associated with bad decisions of the past has caused the failure to acknowledge the affects of bad decisions on the community at the time the public decisions are made. The public is lead to believe that one set of ideas is correct... The state data center does not provide small-scale forecasts. They provide... Local agencies and local offices provide small-scale forecasts, and they get to put where they think it's best, and where they think it's appropriate to allocate population... Experts providing this information for Williamson County are not in \_\_\_ and are biased when providing this information. There have been no presentations for either of these forecasts, or time horizons that have been... for this poorly anticipated traffic law that is associated with these population statistics.

As a professional, I would expect to see a presentation on what the forecasted volumes are... and a "Plan A" / "Plan B" where you get a comparison of what happens. If it looks bad with one, does it look better on the other? There has been none. This has been a hidden program the whole way through. I have no confidence in the underlying technical work that is supposed to justify the plan, as was developed in 1999. I have become very \_\_\_ of the \_\_\_ that did much of the planning throughout this region. I know that the election committee directly associated with the road bond issue...and I have every expectation that the road bond program itself is no different...that it's the same people.

*[applause]*

**Speaker 3:**

I have a couple of questions. First of all, I am **Carol Fox**. I live 1 mile west of \_\_\_ on CR 374. I am opposed to Chandler Road for all the reasons everyone has mentioned. But, the questions that I have right now are what essentially is the purpose of these meetings? What will happen to our written comments? Will it in any way change what is going on? Does the county make decisions prior and without regard? Are we allowed to express our opinions just so the county can say we've heard everyone, or will there be a change because of what we say?

*[applause]*

**Nancy:** As I stated earlier, what we will do is after all the public meetings we will summarize the comments we've received, we will put together a summary of each roadway to present to the court. About 2 weeks after the last public hearing, the court will be considering the amendments. I would like to add that some of the reasons why we are making some of these amendments have been because of the public involvement process that goes through all the road bond programs. After we received the preliminary engineering, we had other public meetings and people made suggestions for change.

**From audience:** Why were the people in the Chandler Road area not given a public meeting?

I don't know if one was requested...

**From audience:** We sent a petition to the county commissioners a year ago for a public hearing about that...*[inaudible comments]*

**Speaker 4:**

My name is **Jim Jirasek** and I live out on CR 365. I asked Mr. Limmer about considering going to the state concerning Highway 29...through the county rather than changing all of Chandler Road. The road is good, but you have to preserve some \_\_\_\_ for this county. I think building or even having some sort of road route is nothing that *[inaudible]*. We talk about all these proposed roads, but my main concern is what is going to be done with the present roads and bridges we have. Where is the money coming from? I think the voters we expected some of the bond money to be used for existing roads and bridges. I think there is a general fund, or a road and bridge fund, and obviously there must not be any money there because nothing getting done on these roads. So, I guess that \$350 million bond project...I think proposed changes have been suggested and cutting back...where is the money going to go, and where is it coming from? Is the county just going to shoot the tank funds from whatever source they can without voter approval? That's some of my comments.

**Speaker 5: [Jerry Mehevic]**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak...*[inaudible]* *[laughter, applause]* I've asked for the...to up the total of the road bond to set aside some for the county roads. I think when they voted for it, they voted to improve *[inaudible]* and then with the money left over, I think they were hoping for some changes. 29 is a very good road...way out there in west Texas. It goes a long way. You can go a long way with 29. There are a lot of people that come to Williamson County that didn't know about 29. I know that the city of Georgetown *[inaudible]* needs to improve the annual traffic. They've got traffic lights downtown that nobody can get through. The nursing home people usually have to take...*[inaudible]* *[laughter]*.

I'd like to address some of the roads that y'all have in here. If you really look at it, they are basically all roads that need to be built with county funds. They go through land that is basically farmland. Avery Ranch for contract...but there's basically nothing out there. CR 119 and the Hutto Bypass—you go through the existing roads out there now, right after 136 hits 1660, and there's a huge dip in there. It's almost like swamp...the road is underwater, and in bad condition. And so, except for being a \_\_\_\_ road there's really not a whole lot of purpose in trying to fix it. 175 is another extension—there's nothing out there. 273 is another \_\_\_\_ road on the long side of 183. You just go through this whole thing *[inaudible]*.

Commissioner Limmer made the statement that there's not any plans in the future to *[inaudible]*. In 1959, they passed a law that Precinct 4 would be paid for by the rest of the county. They thought that Precinct 4, all the way to the county line *[inaudible]*...For years, when I first came out of business school, I asked Commissioner Limmer to start buying right of way. And he basically said there's not going to be roads east of \_\_\_\_ *[inaudible]*. Of course, you can't buy right of way from the South side. The only reason... was because of the courthouse. 2 commissioners and a county judge decided that *[inaudible]*.

As far as ethics, as far as checking bills—back in 1996, I went to the county auditor and the county treasurer and I also had a meeting with the county judge and the district judge. And what he said was...and I couldn't figure out who was getting paid for what, and sometimes you submit bills two or three different ways. It just depends. If you process those bills it's going to take a lot to figure out something is going on.

[applause]

**Speaker 5: [Agnes Prutino]**

Well, I'm not quite as old-timer as Jerry Mehevic out here in Williamson County. I've only been here 17 years, and I respect Mr. Mehevic other than his [inaudible]. But, he was a good Commissioner and he kept the trash off the road, and things like that. Good things. I am really concerned. I know this [meeting] is about this nice fancy plan and everything, but I am very concerned. You talk about "you build it and they'll come". Well guess what? They've already come. I live North of here on CR 110 above CR 112, that is. My route keeps me off of this lower route of CR 110 below 112 down to 79. That section of the roadway is abominable. I came up that road accidentally the other day. I won't use it again. I will come right back up to 1460 and back up the other way to get home. It is dangerous! Now you cannot tell me that this county cannot spend—they've got big fat bonds and issues and blah-blah-blah—and you can't tell me that this county can't spend a little money to repair this road. That's a main arterial North and South to Georgetown from 29 to Highway 79. So let's do first things first and worry about all the fancy developer type roads next if they want to mess with roads like that. Thank you

[applause]

**Speaker 6:**

I'm **Louis Repa**. I asked Mr. Limmer about a while ago about—here about a year ago in the Austin area we had about 10 bridges on our County Roads that are too dangerous for our school buses to go over. He told me he did a great job and had gotten 4 bridges approved to be fixed. What about these other 6? We should go ahead and direct some of this bond money to these bridges...before these roads are developed. Use this money where its needed so our school buses can have roads, not on development...we need to change our thinking with the county and start thinking of the people.

[tape cuts off]

**Speaker 7: [Speaker Unknown]**

...One of the things I was concerned with is the expense for the right of way is so much higher [inaudible] Generally, with existing county roads, there's a lot of resistance to \_\_\_ that road so that the roadway can be improved. With CR 137—is there anyone here that lives on 137? Now it's dangerous, isn't it? [inaudible comments] You don't think it's dangerous?

**From audience:** ...You're just making it more dangerous if you come in there...because you'll take another 10 feet...and you say its making it safer...how is it safer when you've got 10 more feet of cars coming at you? And we're old people...some of these people go 6 miles an hour [laughter]...and it's not any more safer...

So you're saying it's just as safe now as it was—how long have you lived there?

**From audience:** 25 years.

So it's just as safe now as it was 25 years ago—is that what you're saying?

**From audience:** No! *[inaudible comments]*...now there's people that have no respect for others.

Actually, that brings me to, I guess, the big question here and it's really what I wanted to ask. Do y'all agree that Williamson County has some bad roads? *[inaudible audience comments]* Do you think fixing the potholes is going to fix the roads? *[inaudible audience comments]* Well, I don't know...to me just fixing the potholes doesn't seem like it was the intent of the \$350 million.

**From audience:** No, but rebuilding the face of the roads and the pavement structure so that you've got a road that's decent was *[the intent of the \$350 million]*.

Well, you're an engineer, so, as you know you have to increase the right of way width.

**From Audience:** No, you don't have to increase the right of way width in all cases.

Well, not in all cases, but how can you—there's a lot more people using these roads. There's a lot more traffic. And the roads have to serve all this traffic. They're not doing the job now. Just fixing the existing pavement...So I guess my question—since all your comments are going to the Commissioner's Court is—are the commissioners even understanding the direction that the citizens of Williamson County want to redirect the \$350 million to? Is it not the intent of the people of Williamson County to improve the roads? And once again, I will sternly say that you can't improve a road that's 20 feet long with the traffic that you have on those roads—like CR 110. Now, I want to tell you one thing. About 4 years ago, I was working on a CR over here in Leander, CR 272. Of course the people there were resisting to the purchase of right of way...but it got to where it was so dangerous, they wanted me to come through and purchase right of way...It just got to be a real hazard to them. So their thinking actually kind of changed as traffic increased. I think some of what the Commissioner is trying to do is predict where that's going to happen in the future. And it's a certainty that it's going to happen. So once again, my real question is are the Commissioners understanding what the people of Williamson County want. If the Commissioners are not making good plans, who will suggest to them what an alternative plan will be? So that's what I'm saying. In my opinion, Williamson County needs better roads. And if they need the better roads, somebody has got to step forward and start making some logical decisions like this engineer in the back...Unfortunately it seems like sometimes when people step forward, and try to make those plans, they get criticism and accusations of the charismatic...Cooperation is what will build roads in Williamson County.

*[Inaudible audience comment]*

---

I may be a little confused by your question. Chandler Road, for instance *[inaudible]*. I know when I drive by...and look to my left, all I see is hills. *[audience murmurs]*. Well, let me finish. My point is there is no point in buying land where there are people living on it. It's been my experience that in Williamson County when people complain about the road that they just want to get it put on somebody else's land. My point is, it's the Commissioners that are building the roads. If they are not doing a good job here or not building the right roads, then maybe the citizens of Williamson County can come up with something where they just guess the way to get out traffic situation improved without...*[inaudible]*

*[Inaudible audience comment]*

That's my point. They need additional support to get meetings like this...I guess I just wanted to make my point. I live in Williamson County, and I'm very fond of Williamson County, and I want to see it fill up and grow. It has certainly changed a lot since I was in elementary school...Thank you.

**Speaker 8:**

My name is Avery Tucker and I live here on CR 122 South of 79...and what I came up here for is one thing...I agree that things ought to be as \_\_\_ as possible. But *[inaudible]*...I've got some problems with \_\_\_, big time. And I've got of got around without bumping into it, but now, I see it everywhere. Mr. Limmer said a minute ago that he's very interested in doing what's right for Williamson County. And that's well and good. But is he interested in doing what's right for Williamson County as long as he and some of his associates *[benefit]*. *[Inaudible]*... My ranch is on that one \_\_\_, and now there's all kinds of people coming out there, landowners lusting for that ordinance. I might add that one of the first ones was \_\_\_ Carson who *[inaudible]* for evading taxes and on another matter he avoided this trial to start. He pled guilty to a \$2 million theft charge against the oil companies and oil related businesses. And without telling anybody, investors *[inaudible]*. But I did notice—the Round Rock Leader ran a story a while ago—that Mike Robinson was setting up a \_\_\_ distortion to bring the water to Williamson County...He has created a state department of *[inaudible]*. He has created an alliance will Willcox water \_\_\_ on the same day he created *[inaudible]*...  
*[applause]*

**Nancy:** Do you have any more comments related to the plan amendments?

**Avery Tucker:** I guess I'm finished.

**Speaker 9: (Speaker Unknown)**

I'm \_\_\_, professional engineer working with TxDOT. A few concerns the surveyors have had regarding those things...People make their living off the roads being built. All these folks are contractors *[inaudible]*...whose the big push behind this? Developers? *[inaudible]*



Next thing, one of the problems is the county. We have been asking for a year. Somebody looks at how our \$350 million program—what the priorities are—1, 2, 3, 4 down the list. No one has responded...There are engineers in Austin who haven't even been to Williamson County. They don't know what's out there. They just look at lines on a map...They are not looking at what the land it's own. My wife and I just bought this property. And we knew that Chandler Road had a chance to go through that. And now we've got it cutting diagonally through it, so what do you do? So, if you don't have any clue, you just draw lines on a map. You don't know what's going to be there. *[inaudible]* So I appreciate the chance to talk. Again, give us an opportunity with Chandler Road, and we'll keep working with the county.

*Nancy:* Once again, we need to receive any written comments by August 5<sup>th</sup>. Thank you again for coming.

**Proposed Amendments to the  
Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan  
Williamson County Annex, #3  
July 23, 2002**

\* This is the July 23, 2002 public hearing on the Williamson County Multi Corridor Transportation Plan.

**Nancy:** Welcome to the public hearing for the Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan Proposed Amendments. Thank you for coming to the meeting tonight. We have had two other public hearings—one this morning and one on July 11<sup>th</sup>. The same information was presented at those meetings.

The format of tonight's meeting will be: I talk for about 15-20 minutes on the reasons why we are proposing these amendments to the Plan and what the amendments are. Then we will open it up for your comments. Staff will be summarizing all of the input we hear from you and others and will present the information to the Commissioners' Court in early August for their adoption consideration of the amendments in mid August. We need to receive your comments by August 5<sup>th</sup>. If you wish to speak tonight please fill out a speaker form that Annette has in the back.

The County adopted the Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan in 1999. This is a long-range transportation Plan that identifies the transportation needs to the year 2025. Historically the County had been waiting on the State to build some of these needed roads, but because of the lengthy process and roads not being built in a timely manner, the Commissioners Court decided to move ahead to initiate some the most important project, preserve corridors and facilitate partnerships with municipalities and state agencies. In other words, leverage our local dollars to get more projects and projects built faster.

Since the time that this plan was adopted, we now have updated population demographics, detailed area studies and an updated transportation model.

We have experienced phenomenal growth in our county and its forecasted for this trend to continue. Williamson County is the 5<sup>th</sup> fastest growing county in the country. Our population in the year 2000 was 250,000 people. Forecasts show that we will double in population by the year 2017 to 510,000 then add another 300,000 person again by the year 2027.

2000	2007	2017	2027
250,000	347,000	510,000	803,000

We have to plan for this kind of growth and that is the main intent of the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Another big event that occurred since the Plan was adopted in 1999 was the County's transportation bond election in November 2000. Since the bond election, preliminary engineering and environmental studies have been conducted that have caused the need for some route location changes and changes to the plan. All of these activities (new demographics, detailed area studies, an updated transportation model and the bond

election) necessitate amending the County's Transportation Plan to reflect the latest and most accurate information.

The handout that you received when you came in contains a table of the proposed amendments and a project map of each of these (with the exception of the roads that are being removed). The table lists the road project, the limits of that project and then we have three columns delineating the number of lanes planned by the years 2007, 2027 and 2027. We also have a column that shows what was adopted in the currently adopted plan to the year 2025. And the notes column explains the proposed change.

The reason we use these years is for air quality modeling purposes that CAMPO (a regional planning group) will need to run their transportation models.

I will now run through the table that lists the proposed amendments. You have a map of each one. ...*[Summary of Proposed Changes to the Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan--see handout]*

**\*\* Note:** In this meeting, no microphones were available, making the tape almost impossible to hear. Because of this, the order of the meeting is not adequately presented in this transcript. Audible comments have been transcribed below:

**From Audience:** In relation to 1431 and 1433, where are they? Are they working there way to 1431 from 1433? How were you able to plan right through my property without my knowledge of it?

**Pix Howell:** The corridor study was done to identify...I think the meeting you are talking about dealt with Kitty Hill [Airport].

**From Audience:** And I find it most remarkable that about 3 airplanes can fly out of that airport...

Well, there is discussion about that becoming more than what it is.

**From Audience:** You mean the airport itself?

Yes...So the preliminary engineering report was based on that last public meeting. It shows the roadway going through that corridor, dipping down through your property, as you say. *[inaudible audience comment]* Right now, it is of the opinion that it will be built—are you familiar with Oak Road? This is actually the end of 377 on the west side of 183. That's a bad intersection. We've determined that the best way to fix that is to actually extend it further south to Oak Hill Road. Extending it further south... *[inaudible]*

**From Audience:** I was informed that I didn't need to worry about it [the area] because it was a long way away. But my concern is that it will be too late. When should I be concerned?

My suggestion is that you keep in touch and pay attention to what's going on.  
[inaudible]...

**From Audience:** Why has that change [Parmer veering to the Northwest] been made?

I don't know the engineering of that. It has to do with the vertical and horizontal design of the roadway, the cost of the bridge over that portion of the lake, and right of way considerations.

**From Audience:** [comments from Mr. & Mrs. Jim Van Artsdalen] Why have the trees in the area not been considered?

**Joe England:** I was trying to avoid kicking people out of their homes. If there were a bunch of trees on one route, and homes and barns on the other route, I choose to build over the trees.

**From Audience:** Are there any plans to come and actually look at the properties to see how you could rebuild? The way I see it, you can build a new barn, but you can't build a new tree.

There has only been one case to my knowledge where the road was moved to avoid a tree, and that was an oak where the trunk was about 10 feet around.

**From Audience:** We have so many old oaks, too. I have a lot of mesquite trees you can take. [laughter]

**\*\*Note:** Nancy Ledbetter advised Mr. & Mrs. Artsdalen to set up a private meeting with Mr. England to discuss their specific property.

**\*\* Inaudible audience comments have been summarized below:**

- Why are these changes needed? Why are specific roads being built?
- When will projected population information be available? [basic questions on figures and availability]
- Where does Williamson County receive their information on the population growth?
- Why are Williamson County citizens not informed?
- Change to Parmer Lane route.
- Dell said they were not projecting any growth. How were those figures taken into account?
- Kitty Hill Airport
- Breakdown of the remaining money—where can that information be acquired?
- Desire to see map of proposed routes before they became “set in stone”.
- Who do I talk to if I want to ask about the reasoning behind a specific road?

**MINUTES**

of the

**WILLIAMSON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' COURT MEETING****July 23, 2002**

THE STATE OF TEXAS     )(

COUNTY OF WILLIAMSON)(

BE IT REMEMBERED that at 9:40 a.m. on July 23, 2002, a SPECIAL SESSION of the Commissioners' Court of Williamson County, Texas, was held with the following members being present, to-wit:

ABSENT               JOHN C. DOERFLER, County Judge  
                      MICHAEL L. HEILIGENSTEIN, Commissioner, Precinct 1  
                      GREGORY W. BOATRIGHT, Commissioner, Precinct 2  
                      DAVID HAYS, Commissioner, Precinct 3  
                      FRANKIE LIMMER, Commissioner, Precinct 4  
                      EUGENE D. TAYLOR, County Attorney  
                      NANCY E. RISTER, County Clerk

**COMMISSIONERS' COURT RECESSED AT 10:40 A.M. ON JULY 23, 2002.**

**COMMISSIONERS' COURT RECONVENED IN THE JUSTICE OF THE PEACE PRECINCT #3 COURTROOM AT 10:50 A.M. ON TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2002.**

**AGENDA ITEM 37**

Hold public hearing on proposed amendments to the Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan.

Judge Doerfler announced the public hearing open at 10:50 a.m. on Tuesday, July 23, 2002.

Nancy Ledbetter gave an overview of the Williamson County Multi-Corridor Transportation Plan.

**Louis Repa** of Granger inquired about the alignment of CR 301, and said that he thought the map showing the alignment was wrong.

**Jim Vance** of FM 1331 near Circleville addressed the court in opposition to the extension of Chandler Road. He stated that the map handed out at this public hearing is different from the map at the hearing on July 11, 2002. Mr. Vance stated that he has no confidence in the underlying technical work done as a basis of the transportation plan. He stated that he does not believe that the population forecasts for the project were done by an independent firm with no interest in the project.

Nancy Ledbetter stated that Commissioner Limmer had pointed out that there was an error on the map at the hearing held on July 11, and it was corrected by hand at that time. She stated that the population projections done by Texas Alliance Transportation Group were based on state data totals for the county. After the initial forecast was done, County staff and consultants reviewed them and the results were sent to the cities for review. After input from the cities, the forecasts were presented to and endorsed by the Williamson County Commissioners' Court. After approval by Commissioners' Court, the forecasts were submitted to CAMPO for

---

another review and were sent to the Texas Transportation Institute for review and some corrections.

**Hank Naizer**, a landowner near Granger, spoke about bond issues and against the extension of Chandler Road beyond FM 1460. He said that he feels the bond issues are vaguely worded, and that many people believed that the bond issue would address repairs to existing county roads, rather than creating new roads. He expressed concern that the Chandler Road extension would impact the San Gabriel River.

Commissioner Limmer stated that the Chandler Road extension project lies within the Brushy Creek watershed.

**Jim Jirasek** of Taylor stated that he lacks confidence in the road bond program. He feels there are other issues that need to be taken in to consideration along with roads, such as water issues. He believes that SH 29 could serve as a traffic corridor between the eastern and western portions of the county.

**Carol Fox** of CR 374 near Circleville stated her opposition to the extension of Chandler Road past FM 1660. Ms. Fox said that if a road is built in a particular area, growth will follow. She stated that while development adds to the tax base, it also adds to needed services, and that the American Farm Federation has found that farmland actually nets the county more tax dollars.

**Erlette McMinn** of CR 109, Georgetown, stated that growth will come anyway, and that it is better to plan for it, as it will only cost more to attempt to address it after the fact.

Judge Doerfler announced the public hearing closed at 11:28 a.m. on Tuesday, July 23, 2002.

**COMMISSIONERS' COURT RECESSED AT 11:28 A.M. ON TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2002.**

-----Original Message-----

From: Claire B Namken [mailto:cbnamken@juno.com]  
Sent: Monday, July 29, 2002 9:31 AM  
To: [nancyl@texas.net](mailto:nancyl@texas.net); [nledbetter@wilco.org](mailto:nledbetter@wilco.org)  
Cc: [mjweaver@austin.rr.com](mailto:mjweaver@austin.rr.com); [jengland@wilco.org](mailto:jengland@wilco.org);  
[mike.krusee@house.state.tx.us](mailto:mike.krusee@house.state.tx.us)  
Subject: Objections to C/R 137 Realignment Project

One more "public meeting " without any resolutions to the "public" concerns. One more meeting where the speakers couldn't or wouldn't answer questions asked of them. One more meeting with an audience that had multiple interests in multiple projects instead of a specific meeting to address specific concerns. My husband and I have written to you after other such meetings voicing our objections to the C/R 137 project but no one appears to listen even though you invite comments and questions.

We attended the meeting at Dell Diamond on July 11th, but were the only residents there from C/R 137 - in fact our immediate neighbors did not receive notification of it. So once again I will try to get your attention and appeal to your good senses which , hopefully , will result in some answers and changes to the plan to destroy our neighborhood and home of 25 years.

We fail to see why the road needs to be changed to accommodate people who are not obeying the law by driving too fast nor why we should be forced to give up any of our property to protect them. The posted speed limit is 40 mph yet most drivers come through at much higher speed . If more speed limit signs were displayed and enforced the road would be perfectly safe for everyone - residents and travellers. After my last letter I received three calls from different officers assuring me they would be patrolling the area but I have yet to see this happening and the cars are still speeding through on their rush to get to and from FM 685 for the Austin commute. Making the road wider and straighter will only increase the speed not reduce it thereby making it more unsafe for the residents and other drivers.

Much of the problem would be solved if you had been proactive by planning a road from FM 1660 to FM 685 through the new development west of FM 1660 while still in the building stage instead of routing all the traffic through an established community. Maybe it is not too late for this logic to happen.

At the first meeting we attended last year Commissioner Limmer and friends stated that the widening of C/R 137 would have minimal impact on residents - just add 2' either side to the road to meet some State requirement and be sure the shoulder was wide enough for the mowers . There is already a 10' shoulder outside our home so there is no problem here, yet we are being told you intend to come another 15' into our property.. It appears that major changes are happening on our side while none are touching the land opposite belonging to the Triple Crown dog farm whose owner is the principal requester for the changes , according

to Comm. Limmer , for the benefit of his out of area clientele..We view this as pure harassment and vindictiveness aimed at us because we dared to object to the project and refused to sign the waiver to allow your employees to enter our property, although this has not stopped them from doing so on several occasions. They have now had the audacity to come in to put markers on the proposed R.O.W . Further signs of you flexing your muscles at us.

Why are you not planning on taking land from the other side since they support the project and own far more land which is just farm land ? There are no residences or utilities to disturb just a couple of poles to move whereas this side there are water meters , telephone and electric service all to be moved at tax payers' expense I am sure.. All this points to more harassment of the "little guys" who can't defend themselves in favor of the big landowner who has many state and city agencies as customers and probably has the ear of many elected officials. This was obvious when the last " public" meeting was held on Triple Crown property . Comm. Limmer's excuse was that he wanted to save tax payers' money . He would save more by canceling the whole project which is just to benefit certain interest groups and is a misuse of tax money. Also , that they have been allowed to install permanent direction signs at all entries into the area from C/R 138 and C/R 137 on county property. In closing I would like to point out that, contrary to what we keep being told , this project would not make the road safer for me or my family . Not only will it impact the tranquility of our home by putting traffic closer to it but by making the road wider you are increasing the risk of 70 year olds being hit by speeding traffic when we access our mail box which is on the other side.

There are many other roads in Williamson County in greater need of help than C/R 137 . Is it just a coincidence that Comm. Limmer lives in the area and may benefit from the changes ? I am sure this is not what voters had in mind for the bond money. Take a look at the sorry shape of C/R 133 @ FM 1660 north and C/R 394 which was ripped up by the county over 2 years ago and has yet to be finished. Also, the road which goes behind Old Settlers Park and Dell Diamond is a nightmare to drive with potholes and bumper to bumper traffic and could use some help.. Hoping that some of our questions and comments do not fall on deaf ears and that maybe they will result in some positive changes . .

Yours in anticipation,

Claire B Namken  
1701 C/R 137  
Hutto,  
Tx 78634



**AGENDA ITEM 19**

Consider approval of additional services for CR 258.

Moved: **Commissioner Boatright**

Seconded: **Commissioner Limmer**

Motion: To approve additional services for Haynie Consulting for CR 258 in the amount of \$12,500 to prepare and submit an Edwards Aquifer application to TNRCC and to perform a right-of-way survey for the project.

Vote: 3 – 0. **Commissioner Heiligenstein was absent from the dais.**

< Attachment >



HAYNIE CONSULTING, INC.  
CIVIL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS

July 24, 2002

Mr. Mike Weaver  
Prime Strategies  
1508 South Lamar  
Austin, Texas 78704

RE: Williamson County Road Projects  
Request of Additional Work Authorization  
CR 258

*Approved  
3-0 / 8-5-02*

Dear Mr. Weaver,

The CR 258 road design is nearly complete. Two items of work have surfaced which were not anticipated.

The road realignments are through heavy cedar breaks which have taken an extra week cutting and clearing to complete the right-of-way stake out.

The additional right-of-way take has increased the disturbed areas and will require a TNRCC Edward's Aquifer Contributing Zone application. We did not anticipate this item of work in our engineer's scope of work.

Please consider the attached Work Authorization No. 2. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to call me at 512-837-2446, extension 208.

Sincerely,

Timothy E. Haynie, P.E., R.P.L.S.  
Professional Engineer (Civil) License No. 36982  
Haynie Consulting, Inc.

C:\cr-2002\Letters\mw-cr258.doc