

First Name	Last Name	Address1	City	State	Zip	Email Address	Comments:	Response	Comment Type
Cynthia	Hobson	701 Indiana St	San Marcos	TX	78666	houstonclay@yahoo.com	<p>I would like to commend the Engineering and Capital Improvements Department for this revision of the Transportation Master Plan, which is badly needed. I am a long-time resident of the city of San Marcos, and keenly aware of the changes and growth pressures in our area. I believe staff have done a great job with this revision of the Transportation Master plan, but more needs to be done. I moved here in the 1990s, and the main reason was quality of life, which centers our cool, clear-flowing San Marcos River. At this critical turning point in our city's growth, it is vital to steer transportation plans away from areas that will affect the flow or quality of the river, whether through impacts to surface runoff or the aquifer itself. We have known for decades about the environmentally sensitive areas to the west and northwest of the city. Transportation plans need to fully incorporate this knowledge and plan road development around those areas. It is now or never to protect our environment, quality of life, and economic development. There is no rewind button on road construction when we realize we have messed up the river. Let us elevate these environmental concerns to a higher level in planning locations of roads and related infrastructure. Please remove roads from the plan such as the Craddock Lane extension, and other roads near Sink Springs, and in the watershed of Sink Creek and Spring Lake, the headwaters of the San Marcos River.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I have a very favorable impression of City staff, and the fullest confidence that this plan can take us into the future, with road plans diverted away from these very sensitive areas. I would love to think that my children can continue to enjoy this town and its beautiful river for many decades to come.</p>	<p>as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROW's in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Cradock and West Loop</p>	Against Craddock Extension
Stephanie	Symmes	1015 West MLK Drive, Apt A	San Marcos	TX	78666	sbs.select@gmail.com	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review these comments. Below are just some of the input I plan to provide. I would like to stress the importance of an inclusive and diverse community input process in the updates being made to the Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>-- Lack of Public Outreach: Open House event poorly promoted with limited attendance from stakeholders. Minimal continued communication between Engineering Department and San Marcos community.</p> <p>-- Difficult Map Interpretation: Hard to read/understand with no clarification of terminology. Bike Map uses confusing/overlapping colors.</p> <p>-- Limited Accessibility: Only available online? Copies at SM Library?</p> <p>-- Insufficient Transportation Options: Plan doesn't address car/ride sharing, transit hubs, public transportation, regional transit, &amp; minimal bike/walk.</p> <p>-- Consultation within City Departments: Consultants should be meeting with city staff in Planning &amp; Development Services, CARTS, Main Street, Emergency Services, and the Convention &amp; Visitor's Bureau for a more extensive professional opinion relevant to the City of San Marcos.</p> <p>-- More Bike Ability: Map is confusing/difficult to understand. Sharrows should be used in residential areas with slower traffic. Bike lanes instead of sharrows on Hopkins, San Antonio, MLK, Bishop, LBJ, and Mill Street.</p> <p>-- More Walk Ability: No pedestrian-centered map to show existing vs planned infrastructure. Connectivity and continuity of existing pedestrian infrastructure is important (sidewalks, crosswalks, more lighting, etc.)</p> <p>-- Automobile Centric Planning: Smaller lane widths to promote slower traffic (i.e.- 10ft for 35mph speed). Parking maximums vs. minimums.</p> <p>These are just some of the more general comments regarding the Transportation Master Plan Update. A more detailed response will be provided via eMail. Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>Several public outreach activities were organized since the start of TMP update process including, Rhythm of the Street, open houses and online public input portal. These public input activities were advertized using various tools, including press releases.</p> <p>Maps will be revised to differentiate various facilities with contrast colors</p> <p>Once TMP plans are finalized, copies will be provided at various locations including SM Library</p> <p>Car/Ride sharing assumptions were used to develop the traffic model, Transit plan was not included in the planning process. Bike and Pedestrian plan in included in the TMP. Greenways provide pedestrian connections and bike plan provides proposed bike facilities with COSM</p> <p>Other City departments were consulted to provide feedback on the proposed plan. coordination with Planning &amp; Development department was key in the development of TMP plans and cross sections. CodeSMTX and TMP were integrated to develop a comprehensive plan</p> <p>Bike plan will be revised to use different colors for various facilities proposed. sharrows were used on residential streets and on facilities where there is no ROW available to accomodate bike lane and where vehicular traffic takes precedence</p> <p>An overall plan illustrating pedestrian connectivity is prepared as part of TMP. Greenways Plan provide connectivity to existing and proposed pedestrian infrastructure</p> <p>Lane widths were discussed with other departments and min 11' lanes were used for the cross sections. Parking was not part of the TMP</p>	<p>Public involvement is minimal in developing TMP</p> <p>Revise Maps including Bike and Greenways</p> <p>Include Transit Plan</p> <p>Coordinate TMP with other City Departments</p> <p>Include more protected bike lanes</p> <p>Include more pedestrian connections</p>
Carina	Boston Pinales	147 Dolly St.	San Marcos	TX	78666	carina@infiniteopp.com	<p>Copy of additional email: Hi There,</p> <p>I hope this eMail finds you well this afternoon. I am getting in touch to inquire about the Transportation Master Plan update as I am curious if there will be any community outreach opportunities to solicit input from various stakeholders (i.e. - pedestrians, commuters, riders, etc.) and allow citizens a chance to ask questions and view materials. I have recently became aware of the documents available online, but are they available for viewing/comment elsewhere (i.e. - San Marcos Library) ?</p> <p>As a founding member of Bike SMTX, I am personally invested in encouraging a bike-friendly community, and would appreciate the opportunity to work with the city in their efforts to create a city with an assortment of safe and reliable transportation options.</p> <p>We are currently hosting a meet-up on Monday, November 6th, from 6-7pm at Splash Coworking, to discuss the updates and would like to extend an invite to the department. I have copied a link to the Facebook event at the bottom of this eMail for your convenience. If you are interested in speaking, providing material, or collaborating with us further, please don't hesitate to get in touch. In the meantime, I hope you enjoy your day and I look forward to your response.</p> <p>Kindly,</p> <p>Stephanie Symmes</p> <p>Sustainable Placemakers November Meetup  <a href="https://www.facebook.com/events/178274719391701/">https://www.facebook.com/events/178274719391701/</a></p>	<p>various opportunities were provided to the public to comment on the proposed plans. Materials are available online and when approved it will be available for viewing at San Marcos Library. Bike SMTX coordination was done in 2016 where COSM received input on Bike Infrastructure Plan</p>	Public involvement is minimal in developing TMP
Sophia	Mavroudas	200 Hunter rdg	san marcos	tx	78666	sophiarose04@gmail.com	I am very excited about the prospect of a road connecting central ave with Old ranch rd 12.	NA	Positive feedback on TMP
Erica	Renger	764 Clear View Cir	San Marcos	TX	78666	tippytaskmaster@yahoo.com	<p>It does not make sense to separate the neighborhood school from the closest neighborhood with a thoroughfare. I do not agree with the Boulevard suggested for expanding Crystal River Parkway in the Hills of Hays neighborhood. Put the road on the other side of the school or on the other side of the neighborhood. Do not separate the school from the neighborhood. There are already several roads that connect Staples Road to 123. Connecting 21 to 123 via the suggested Boulevard in Hills of Hays is inviting 18 wheeler traffic through the neighborhood. I totally disagree with is road.</p> <p>Fix the continuous flow intersections. They are awful! Please do not add any additional continuous flow intersections.</p> <p>There is very little road development suggested for the north and west of IH35.</p>	<p>Crystal River Pkwy connection will be part of Hwy 21 extension and is warranted as per the traffic growth projections. 18 wheelers restriction and access management can be addressed during the design phase of this project and is not scheduled in next 10 years</p> <p>continuous flow intersections were constructed by TxDOT and are not under COSM jurisdiction.</p> <p>Craddock extension and West Loop are major thoroughfares proposed north and west of IH35</p>	Issues with the proposed Crystal River Pkwy/Hwy 21 extension
Carla	Powell	312 Ancient Oak Way	San Marcos	TX	78666	Powellcj@aol.com	<p>I would like to suggest connecting Old Stagecoach Road eastward to Riverway which connects to I-35. This would give people access to 5 Mile Dam without having to drive through Blanco Vista.</p> <p>I oppose having Yarrington Road go through! So many trees have already been cut down and animals displaced with the continuous building in Blanco Vista. It is time to stop building and leave some nature landscape in this area.</p>	<p>Old Stagecoach Rd alignment and new bridge over Blanco River is proposed under TMP.</p> <p>Yarrington Road will eventually become part of FM 110</p>	Issue with Old Stagecoach alignment/extension to IH35
Amanda	Hargrave	119 Lake Glen	San Marcos	TX	78666	Amandawinn222@yahoo.com	Looks good. I donâ€™t want the HEB at Hunter and wonder world though. We need a grocery store on the east side. Itâ€™s a food desert over here. Also, I think it would congest that intersection and create more noise at the natural area where we have golden-cheeked warblers. A noise analysis is needed to see what the impacts might be. The models said development on sessom wouldnâ€™t contribute to flooding and it does. It seems like building HEB there and a parking lot would create more impervious cover near purgatory creek.	HEB has been approved by Council and is not part of TMP development.	Issue with HEB Development at WW Dr/Hunter Rd
Calbert	Marcantel	626 Irvin Drive	San Marcos	TX	78666	cmarcantel62@gmail.com	<p>Yarrington Road has been identified as a major roadway/loop.</p> <p>A good transportation solution that hasn't appeared in the plan yet is to connect Old Stagecoach Rd eastward to Riverway, which connects to I-35. That would make a huge difference for accessibility, would encourage some commercial/retail development to serve the area on that part of I-35, reduce police/fire/ems response times and would give a more direct route for thru traffic to access 5-mile dam without requiring drivers to drive through the length of Blanco Vista. It is also, by comparison, a really cheap solution compared to other proposed thoroughfares seeking to connect between Post Rd and I-35.</p>	<p>Old Stagecoach will be realigned with a new bridge and connect to Post Road in future. In addition connection to IH35 is proposed just south of Riverwalk Dr via Riverway Avenue.</p> <p>The proposed connection to IH35 will provide direct access to Post Road; reduce emergency services response time and encourage commercial/retail development</p>	Issue with Old Stagecoach alignment/extension to IH35
Jennifer	Sutton	925 Easton Dr	San Marcos	Texas	78666	Jennsutton5@gmail.com	Please extend Old Stagecoach Rd to Riverway Ave to increase traffic flow, relieve traffic on the bridge across the river that is currently under construction, increase EMS access, and minimize traffic through the neighborhood to Five Mile Park.	<p>Old Stagecoach will be realigned with a new bridge and connect to Post Road in future. In addition connection to IH35 is proposed just south of Riverwalk Dr via Riverway Avenue.</p> <p>The proposed connection to IH35 will provide direct access to Post Road; reduce emergency services response time and encourage commercial/retail development</p>	Issue with Old Stagecoach alignment/extension to IH35

Ryan	Ortiz	900 Peques St. Apt 1701	San Marcos	Tx	78666	ortiz.ryanm@yahoo.com	I recently moved back to San Marcos, TX after graduating with a bachelors degree in Entrepreneurship from Texas State University. I love the forward thinking of this community. I am a working professional of Ecommerce who works in San Antonio. I am excited for what the future holds in San Marcos and would love to help or offer assistance in any way. The plans for the future are great and I could not be more exited for the leadership you all are providing to the community.	NA	Other
							Is there any way I may become involved?		
Rand	Zeolla	819 old ranch rd 12	San Marcos	Tx	78666	Rand.zeolla@gmail.com	Depressing y'all aren't considering a metro line in cooperation with our neighbors. Building more roads just promotes more driving and isn't going to help traffic congestion. Promotes CO2 emissions. Promotes destroying natural areas. Shame.	metroline in cooperation with neighbors is not warranted for the next 20 years. COSM will consider metroline option during the next TMP update	Transit metroline requirement
Margie	Rodriguez	1256 Hilltop Drive	San Marcos	TX	78666	kika_ybarra@hotmail.com	Very opposed to the proposed changes to the road between DeZavala and Hills of Hays subdivision. This will take away so much from our neighborhood children by opening up increased traffic. The increased traffic will make it unsafe for the children and I'm sure it will bring increased crime also. I'm positive this is not the first time the city has heard these concerns but my hope is that the city will listen to the concerns of its citizens and find an alternative that meets the needs of the city while valuing the input of its tax payers.	Crystal River Pkwy connection will be part of Hwy 21 extension and is warranted as per the traffic growth projections. 18 wheelers restriction and access management can be addressed during the design phase of this project and is not scheduled in next 10 years. safety of children and other issues like increased crime will be evaluated during the next phase.	Issues with the proposed Crystal River Pkwy/Hwy 21 extension
								Stagecoach connection across Purgatory Creek connecting Downtown is proposed under 20 year horizon. In addition other facilities such as Craddock Extension and West Loop are proposed beyond 10 year horizon to alleviate congestion along Hopkins	Issue with Old Stagecoach alignment/extension to IH35
Ryan	Perkins	727 W Hopkins	San Marcos	TX	78666	ryanpatrickperkins@gmail.com	It is imperative the city open additional transportation arteries across town. Currently Hopkins Street is the "only" street that spans/connects our community from one end to the other end, besides I-35. Part of our current downtown traffic issues, and traffic increases through our largest historic district, are caused by having only one (1) option for crossing town (aside from I-35, or crisscrossing around town through various other neighborhoods). If the city continues to ignore the issue of only having one street that fully crosses town, all other transportation plans are futile. Stagecoach is prepped and ready for connection across Purgatory Creek. I implore the city to not wait any longer. Waiting costs us more money in the future, and only makes current matters worse. We need better transportation thoroughfares and new options that allow our busiest areas to be better connected and linked to one another. Adding a second and third option across purgatory creek would connect our community and strengthen our business centers and access to them. Please make connecting Stagecoach across Purgatory Creek into downtown a top priority. For too long we have not planned properly for the growth we've created in various areas of our community. Please focus on what is needed in existing, established neighborhoods and business centers. Thank you.		
								Old Stagecoach will be realigned with a new bridge and connect to Post Road in future. In addition connection to IH35 is proposed just south of Riverwalk Dr via Riverway Avenue.	Issue with Old Stagecoach alignment/extension to IH35
Sam	Norman	122 Friendship Oak Drive	San Marcos	TX	78666	Sam.Norman82@gmail.com	Please do not extend Yarrington to the west around the Blanco Vista development. There is already an issue with people cutting through and speeding in the area. Please consider improving both Stagecoach and Post road while creating a connection to Riverway crossing the Blanco River to Post Road. If a new bridge is built please also make it above the floodplain as you are limiting access for all residents in the northeast portion of the city. Building a loop behind San Marcos on the west side will only encourage more development and will take away from the character of the city. I agree with the River Ridge Parkway loop.  Thank you, Sam Norman	The proposed connection to IH35 will provide direct access to Post Road; reduce emergency services response time and encourage commercial/retail development	
								GIS layers used for the bike infrastructure plan will be updated as per the comments received. several public outreach activities were organized since the start of TMP update process including, Rhythm of the Street, open houses and online public input portal.	Revise Maps including Bike and Greenways
							To whom it may concern,	Greenways Master Plan as well as Bike Infrastructure Plan provides opportunities for recreational bike riders as well as commuter cyclists to travel along roadways or greenways. Green Belt Alliance and Bike Advisory groups have provided input in developing the greenways and cike routes.	
Peter	Vogt	222 west Holland street	San Marcos	TX	78666	Pavogt@gmail.com	Recreational bicycle riders often ride from the downtown area of town to the periphery and beyond into the countryside. There needs to be an emphasis on maintaining this access to the countryside. another favorable result of this action would be giving viable commuting routes for bicycle riders in the countryside (which typically has cheaper housing) to the interior of San Marcos (where jobs are.)  another point is that if the city opts to build off-road bicycles paths it is critical to design them for speeds between 10 -20 miles an hour. These speeds are easily attainable for even an inexperienced riders, what is not attainable is a safe riding experience on a winding and circuitous bike path like the upper Walnut Creek trail in Austin. A classic example of a great idea with miserable implementation. Please feel free to email if I am particularly mistaken or if on the off chance you would like further input.  The city should also make a bicycle advisory board	Off-Street bike facilities i.e. greenways will be designed to accomodate average speed for cyclists	
							It's clear that a lot of work has gone into this, but I question many of the premises on which the work is built. This looks like a lot of status-quo thinking here without a clear grasp of the sweeping changes that are on the near horizon. It's stunning to me there's not a cursory pass at any sort of mass transit or even a stab at micro transit. The Downtown/University/Historic District area is ripe for a simple micro transit solution of either electric cabs or simple circulating trolley buses. That these sorts of ideas are not even mentioned in a Transportation Master Plan is beyond concerning to me.	Transit Master Plan was not included in the TMP scope. All other plans including thoroughfare, bike and greenways plans are integrated and provide a multimodal solution to the existing transportation problem. For example bike plan provides connectivity through out the City including bike lanes along roadways or shared use path (greenways) off roadways	Public involvement is minimal in developing TMP Revise Maps including Bike and Greenways Include Transit Plan
							What I see at the flyover scale is a small version of Houston. I hope that is not the goal, but that looks like what we're going to get if we actually follow the plan in these maps. Some specific thoughts:	Several public outreach activities were organized since the start of TMP update process including, Rhythm of the Street, open houses and online public input portal. a community task force will be established for the next TMP update	Coordinate TMP with other City Departments Include more protected bike lanes Include more pedestrian connections
							1. This is not a transportation plan. It is a roads plan. It lays out no vision of any sort of improved mobility, micro, or mass transit and doesn't even include information pertaining to the current bus system and routes. It's difficult to make any assessments of things like trails and bike routes without this most basic information of how the various systems might connect and interact. Recommendation: Add two more maps—one that creates a Public Transit Plan and one that clearly shows the interaction hubs where car, bike, walking and mass transit intersect. At that point we will have actual Transportation Master Plan. As it sits now we have just a Roads Master Plan, which is what it should be called until these other components are added.	TMP plans will be revised as per the comments received.	
							2. The public input process has not been well publicized. I try to follow these things and did not find out about the one public meeting until about 20 minutes beforehand and never heard that this deadline was extended. Recommendation: Publicize the process more on the City and other social media channels. Create a community taskforce or ad-hoc committee around the Master Plan process.	the City adopted a complete street policy and all existing cross sections were updated to include multimodal characteristics. a cost comparison was not performed as most of the new developments will pay for the approved cross sections.	
Christine	Terrell	733 Willow Creek Circle	San Marcos	TX	78666	christineterrell@icloud.com	3. The plan maps seem unreasonably difficult to navigate. The legends were unclear. The Thoroughfare map used redundant labels with different coding. It wasn't user friendly for the layman or even someone like myself with a decent amount of mapping and transportation knowledge. Recommendation: Reevaluate the UX of the maps. Hire a good information designer to more effectively communicate the information you're attempting to convey and get feedback from laymen on whether or not it makes sense to them before you release them to the public.	lane widths were discussed in detail with all City departments and based on the emergency management requirements a min lane width of 11' was recommended for cross sections with 35MPH	
							4. There is not enough information to figure out cost comparisons for current vs. proposed ROW cross-section construction. Its unclear if this plan has a complete streets approach or is just creating wider & more expensive streetscapes. Recommendation: Please provide cost comparisons (e.g., per 100 linear feet) and example renderings for right-of-way construction options.	proposed roads in the southeast corner of the City is a representation and not actually build. the purpose of these roadways shown on thoroughfare map is to protect ROW and construct only if there is any proposed development	
							5. The plan seems to indicate a preference for wider lanes and more impervious cover in slow traffic roads, yet all the latest data shows clearly that we should be decreasing lane widths and narrowing streetscapes to decrease traffic speed and improve walkability and bikeability. Recommendation: Per NACTO recommendations, reduce traffic lanes on 35 mph and stipulate 10' roadways to encourage safer, slower streets and reduce unnecessary impervious cover.	Bike plan colors and legend will be revised as per the comments provided. bike plan was developed by obtaining input from bike advisory groups and other City departments.	
							6. This plan seems to continue a pattern of sprawling development that we've already ascertained is unaffordable and unsustainable. The concentric rings of roads to the south east is incredibly concerning to me. This plan looks like to me like we've learned nothing in the last 50 years. We need a transportation plan that recognizes the move to Compact and Connected Growth policies set out in our own Comprehensive Plan. Recommendation: Remove excessive ring roads from Thoroughfare Plan and reassess the ETJ growth to reflect Compact and Connected Growth strategies.		
							7. The bike map has 4 different green lines that mean 3 different things. It has two different colors for "Shared Use Path". It has "Protected Bike Lanes" in the legend twice. This map is super difficult to understand even at the most basic level. Further, it is not made at the correct scale. This is a car-centric map that considers bikes as an aside. It looks like a map created by people who have never biked a mile in this or any other city. It's difficult to give meaningful feedback on this portion of the plan because the mapping is so poor and the specifics in the accompanying powerpoint information almost non-existent. Recommendation: A bike plan needs to be approached as a viable, primary source of transportation instead of some ugly step-child of car-centric planning. Get a taskforce of people who are bikers to help create this map and any accompanying documentation. Set a preference for City staff who regularly bike to head up the creation of this plan or, better yet require City Staff to bike around town regularly. It's impossible for people who don't bike to create a viable bike plan. It's a fundamentally different form of transportation and can only be properly woven into a transportation plan by people who understand that. Clean up the legend and make the color coding. It would be great to see current and future bicycle routes included in this master plan.	current and future bike routes are provided in the bike infrastructure plan	Other Against Craddock Extension
Andy	Howard	119 E Hopkins St.	San Marcos	Texas	78666	654andy@gmail.com		as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Cradock and West Loop	
Diann	McCabe	1315 Alamo St					Please remove the Craddock Extension from the Transportation Master Plan, as it poses too much risk for the present and future health of our springs.		Against Craddock Extension
								as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop	Against Craddock Extension
Kendall	Bell-Enders						Please remove a roads going through recharge zone (R-8, R20, R2, Craddock extension). The city should not be promoting development of the recharge zone. Once you build a road the development will follow; unless the city plans to purchase the majority of it (Wonder World).		
								as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop	
Phillip	Hicks						Please remove the Craddock Street extension from the Transportation Master Plan. It is essential to limit roads and development in the Sink Creek drainage and recharge zone if there is any hope of preserving the water quality in the aquifer and river. Having the Craddock extension and associated road networks on the master plan indicates the probability of its construction which in turn encourages development. This would be in keeping with the new city charter amendment to protect water quality in our community.		

				<p>I would like to go on record as opposing the extension of Craddock Street and other roadways further into to the San Marcos River/Sink Creek watershed. This area is very environmentally sensitive and protecting it is absolutely critical if we are going to continue having a beautiful, clear river flowing through our community.</p> <p>Having roadways planned in critical recharge zones and in proximity to the headwaters of our San Marcos springs will definitely harm our river. Not only will the construction of these roads be damaging, but they will bring with them an onslaught of new development!</p> <p>I hope that these roads will be omitted from the plan NOW, because once they are drawn on the masterplan maps it GREATLY increases the likelihood that they will be built!</p> <p>On a more positive note: I greatly appreciate the inclusion of the greenbelt and trails system in the masterplan. Having an interconnected system of hiking and biking trails will make travel around the community into a beautiful, healthful experience. This is really a great way to improve the quality of life in our lovely town!</p> <p>Thank you for consideration of these comments.</p>	<p>as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROW's in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p>
Stephanie	Langenkamp	208 Riverside Drive	<a href="mailto:leafspring88@gmail.com">leafspring88@gmail.com</a>			<p>Public involvement is minimal in developing TMP Revise Maps including Bike and Greenways Include Transit Plan Coordinate TMP with other City Departments Include more protected bike lines Include more pedestrian connections</p>
John David	Carson		<a href="mailto: johndavid@carsonproperties.net">johndavid@carsonproperties.net</a>	<p>I'm writing to share comments on the draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The draft TMP maps are definitely an improvement over the more myopic 2004 TMP and the inclusion of more forms of transportation is a step in the right direction. Nevertheless, there still appear to be several changes required to better align the TMP to the Comprehensive Plan and make its implementation more feasible. I respectfully offer the recommendations summarized below. I have also attached a document which includes supporting commentary on each and some additional feedback. Publish a complete TMP document with intent statements and summary analysis for each Mode of Transportation; and, add time and ownership (City/TXDOT) data to the Maps Include a Transit Plan &amp; Map and include planning for Carsharing, Ridesharing, and Autonomous Vehicles Remove vast network of 'ring roads' shown within the ETJ and over the recharge zone from the maps or, at a minimum, show them in a light dash and note as Not-Preferred Centralize a single set of thoroughfare cross-sections and keep ROW widths the same or smaller than existing cross-sections Provide cost estimates that demonstrate the proposed cross-sections represent a per capita cost reduction compared to existing cross-sections Reduce auto lane widths to 10 feet standard on thoroughfares with a design speed less than 35 mph and include a statement that public service vehicles (e.g., fire trucks) are to be designed and purchased to fit the City and not the other way around Refocus the bike plan on improving the existing in-town network for bike commuting by shifting plans from ineffective sharrows to protected lanes, particularly along defined bike routes in the existing core Thanks for taking these perspectives into account. I'm happy to discuss them in more detail as/if appropriate.</p>	<p>Transit Master Plan was not included in the TMP scope. All other plans including thoroughfare, bike and greenways plans are integrated and provide a multimodal solution to the existing transportation problem. For example bike plan provides connectivity through out the City including bike lanes along roadways or shared use path (greenways) off roadways</p> <p>Several public outreach activities were organized since the start of TMP update process including, Rhythm of the Street, open houses and online public input portal. a community task force will be established for the next TMP update</p> <p>TMP plans will be revised as per the comments received.</p> <p>the City adopted a complete street policy and all existing cross sections were updated to include multimodel characteristics. a cost comparison was not performed as most of the new developments will pay for the approved cross sections.</p> <p>lane widths were discussed in detail with all City departments and based on the emergency management requirements a min lane width of 11' was recommended for cross sections with 35MPH</p> <p>proposed roads in the southeast corner of the City is a representation and not actually build. the purpose of these roadways shown on thoroughfare map is to protect ROW and construct only if there is any proposed development</p> <p>Bike plan colors and legend will be revised as per the comments provided. bike plan was developed by obtaining input from bike advisory groups and other City departments.</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p>
Jody	Cross-Blue		<a href="mailto:theartofjodycross@gmail.com">theartofjodycross@gmail.com</a>	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I will not be able to attend the meeting this Wednesday October 18, 2017. However, I would like to leave an official comment saying that I am in favor of more walking/biking trails in San Marcos, TX and less road extensions. I am NOT in favor of the Craddock road extension over Sink Creek area connecting I35 to anywhere else. I think what we have to get from I35 into town and beyond is enough for now and for a while.</p> <p>Thank you, Jody Cross</p>		
Cindy Wynn	Danton Wallace		<p>Cindy Danton &lt;cindeanton@wynnwallace@yahoo.com&gt;</p>	<p>same response as above</p> <p>same response as above</p>	<p>same response as above</p> <p>same response as above</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p> <p>Against Craddock Extension</p>
Richard	McBride		<a href="mailto:docdk@mygrande.net">docdk@mygrande.net</a>	<p>I oppose the Craddock Extension over Sink Creek. It will probably lead to contamination of the creek and thus contamination of Spring Lake and the San Marcos River. This road would pass through one of the most beautiful areas that we have left. It should be preserved for our citizens and not turned into a roadway. Thank you, Richard McBride, San Marcos</p>	<p>same response as above</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p>
Rebecca	Johnston		<a href="mailto:saludhealingarts@gmail.com">saludhealingarts@gmail.com</a>	<p>Hello. My name is Rebecca Johnston and I'm a resident and business owner here in San Marcos. I'd like to put in my two cents about the proposal. It should not build on or impact the area around both Sink Springs and Rattlesnake cave, which have been dye tested and link directly to Spring Lake.</p>	<p>as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROW's in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p>
Paul	Daugherty	475 Piedras Pass	<a href="mailto:pd1068@gmail.com">pd1068@gmail.com</a>	<p>I am writing the message to oppose the proposed Craddock extension to the Transportation Master Plan along with the proposed road network over Sink Creek. If the river is to stay unpolluted we cannot allow development over known recharge zones. Please consider removing the Craddock extension. Sincerely, Paul Daugherty</p>	<p>same response as above</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p>
Tyler	Carlson		<a href="mailto:trc@skinmagic.com">trc@skinmagic.com</a>	<p>In my opinion the Extension should start further west. San Marcos is going to grow and a further west extension would accommodate the growth more effectively. This look very short sighted and based on growth that is in the past and not on future growth. There is a real need to provide a road farther west. This seems a very shallow study done by people who want to fulfill what they think is what is expected. Or maybe plans are based on which developers own what land. One of the side streets seems to go along the Windermere driveway and near the creek bed. It looks convenient but are these guys on crack? The whole area has been flooded repeatedly. Of course they could raise the roadbed (many feet), but that would push the water into homes on the lower parts of Hunters Glen. These homes have already been threatened, but that road would push the water over the top. Moreover, my wife and I thought of buying the land between Derby and Hunters Glen. After walking it, we decided that there was no way the Government would allow development in that area. And now the Government is planning a street there? I hear money talking. Here you are San Marcos and Hays County: In my experience decisions are primarily made based on WHO owns what land. And, here you go again. Sincerely, Tyler Carlson</p>	<p>Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirments. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement.</p> <p>as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROW's in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p>
Lisa	Cradit	507 Pioneer Trail	<a href="mailto:lcradit@tlu.edu">lcradit@tlu.edu</a>	<p>Members considering the Transportation Master Plan,</p> <p>As a long-time member of the San Marcos community, I believe it is very important to protect the Edwards Aquifer and Spring Lake. Therefore, the proposed Craddock extension is a very bad idea, as are the proposed roads near Sink Springs and Rattlesnake cave. All of those will lead to pollution running directly into the aquifer, since we know that dye traces have shown without question that Sink Springs and Rattlesnake cave are directly connected to Spring Lake. Pollution from those proposed roads will run directly into Spring Lake, which will in turn pollute the river, turning the main source of San Marcos' attraction into a polluted, dirty river. Not only that, but homeowners depending on the aquifer for drinking water will also have their wells polluted. I am very much in favor of the plan for trails that is being considered.</p>	<p>same response as above</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p>
Tatjana	Walker		<a href="mailto:tatjana@wordwright.com">tatjana@wordwright.com</a>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to register my opposition to the Craddock extension. This area is too close to the springs and connected water features. Protecting the springs and river should be the first priority in all San Marcos development. Thank you, Tatjana Walker</p>	<p>same response as above</p>	<p>Against Craddock Extension</p>

				same response as above	Against Craddock Extension
Melissa	Sommers-Katz	607 Conway Drive	<a href="mailto:sommersod@aol.com">sommersod@aol.com</a>	After viewing the maps of San Marcos what became obvious was that the major growth of the city would be to the south and east of the current city by virtue of the space in those areas. And the fact that many of these areas are wide open makes transportation development of all types much easier. I believe this is where the future of San Marcis lies and this is where the city should concentrate their efforts. If in fact the Transportation Dept is working on behalf of the citizens of San Marcos and their best interests why should we build another road and bear the cost of this road and the ensuing development that it would undoubtedly bring over a particularly sensitive terrain so that people from Wimberly can drive through our city to get to the freeway? Who is the Craddock Extension for through traffic or San Martians? As the city grows more and more people will live to the south and east so rather work on transportation lanes for the people of San Marcos in these up and coming areas that are not so environmentally sensitive.	
Hayat	Qurunful		<a href="mailto:h.qurunful@gmail.com">h.qurunful@gmail.com</a>	To Whom it may concern, I am a landowner on Old Ranch Road 12 and am VERY disturbed by the proposal of the Craddock extension for various reasons. Mainly, the risks associated with water quality contamination due to development over this extremely sensitive area. The proposal itself seems to have been not thought through fully, nor does it seem you all are actively seeking citizen input. Rather holding a few meetings that locals have to seek out on social media, and hoping to quietly pass this transportation plan. Having worked in the environmental industry for years, I know the potential that this project has to negatively impact our watershed. Once damage is done to a watershed, taking measures to improve the damaged quality can take years and even decades. I do not believe the risk is work the reward in this case. Funneling traffic to the Craddock and RR 12 intersection will only create more congestion in an area that is already too highly congested and dangerous. Living on RR12, I routinely see near-accidents taking place in addition to actual collisions. Focus on the areas of concern in town that need help, instead of adding another project to the list and spreading city resources thin.	Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirements. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement. Against Craddock Extension
Dianne	Wassenich		<a href="mailto:wassenich@grandecom.net">wassenich@grandecom.net</a>	Dear Engineering Dept:Thank you for considering transportation by trail as part of your plan, since it will need to be one of the ways we get around San Marcos in the future, hopefully when our trail loops are completed. Already, thanks to SMGA's trail crew, we can walk from my neighborhood to Lime Kiln Rd. and also the Me	same response as above Against Craddock Extension
Virginia	Parker		<a href="mailto:virginiaparker01@yahoo.com">virginiaparker01@yahoo.com</a>	Hello there! Just wanted to make sure to reiterate my opinion on the Craddock Extension. The Craddock extension is problematic, being so close to the springs. I am also opposed to the network of roads on the plan for the area around Sink Springs and Rattlesnake cave, which have been dye tested and link directly to Spring Lake. I really hope the city will avoid building roads near Spring Lake, sink springs and rattlesnake cave so that we may have a clear and flowing river in the future. The well-being of the river and the city depend on it.. I am also very hopeful that the trails plan will be thoroughly completed because that would not only bolster recreation in San Marcos, but possibly decrease the amount of traffic on the road. I picture San Marcos being as bike/pedestrian friendly as Boulder CO, or something similar, and that is so exciting. Thank you for all you do! -Virginia	same response as above Against Craddock Extension
Jonathan	Grant	600 Leah Avenue, Apt 1102	<a href="mailto:jgrant32@me.com">jgrant32@me.com</a>	I enthusiastically support the trails plan, but I am very much opposed to the Craddock extension and to roads built around Sink Springs and Rattlesnake Cave. How many towns in the world have a beautiful, pure river that is as integral a part of the town as our San Marcos river. If these road plans are adopted and the roads are built, I am afraid we will look back one day with immeasurable sadness and regret at what has been lost to us.	same response as above Against Craddock Extension
Tom	Pope	503 Franklin Drive	<a href="mailto:trilepope@gmail.com">trilepope@gmail.com</a>	Dear Planners I can't make it to the meeting this evening but wanted to get my comments in. I'm in favor of all of the proposed Transportation Master Plans, especially the Craddock Street Extension. If it's planned and built with structures in place for protection of the aquifer and uncontrolled runoff, I don't think the Aquifer and River will be harmed. The route of the outer loop "HW 150-72 may need to change if Kyle follows through with their plan to connect the city of Kyle to Hilliard Road.	favorable Craddock Extension Comment For Craddock Extension
Kelsey	Lee	1115 N. LBJ A4	<a href="mailto:kn27@txstate.edu">kn27@txstate.edu</a>	Hello, My name is Kelsey Lee. I am a graduate student in the Sustainability Studies Masters Program at Texas State. I have lived in San Marcos for five years now, and consider it my home. It is absolutely unethical to develop on the recharge zone above the San Marcos Springs and Sink Creek. The water within and flowing (clearly might I add) from the Edwards Aquifer is not only a priceless resource utilized by the citizens of San Marcos, but also around 1.8 million in San Antonio, which yes then affects citizens of the Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer. This water has been the supply for life in central Texas for thousands of years, and I would be forever ashamed to allow that to end within my lifetime. I cannot make it to comment period about the trails between San Marcos and Kyle and the Craddock Extension. I would like to state for the record I am a voting citizen in San Marcos, and I do not support building trails with the intention for them being utilized by developers in order to Green Wash their developments. Nature Trails in a greenbelt fashion are GREAT if they are for public and wildlife, not developer profit. I do not support the extension of Craddock to connect RR 12 to I 35. Thank you for your time,	Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirements. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement. as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop
Sharon	Lockett		<a href="mailto:slockett.cello@gmail.com">slockett.cello@gmail.com</a>	Let's learn our lesson about rainwater management the easy way - not the hard way like in Houston. By building over its prairie watershed, Houston set up the perfect scenario for repeated flooding in heavy rains, with loss of habitat for wildlife and property damage or loss for residents. Extending Craddock road over an area known to drain directly into Spring Lake is a recipe for pollution of our springs and our river, as future "development" is encouraged rather than managed. Please consider the heritage we pass on to those who come after us, and invest in what is irreplaceable - a clean and sustainable environment. - Sharon Lockett	same response as above Against Craddock Extension
Sarah	Simpson		<a href="mailto:ssimpson@color-space.com">ssimpson@color-space.com</a>	To the San Marcos Engineering Department: Upon further review of the draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP) materials over the last two weeks, I wanted to provide the following additional comments for inclusion into the public review process. Thank you in advance for your review of these additional items. General Draft TMP Commentary • The TMP review materials would benefit from cost comparisons of current versus proposed ROW cross-section construction. Auto-lane also do not appear to cede enough width to create complete and efficient streets as in some cases ROWs are just becoming wider and costlier with more impervious cover. o Recommend that cost comparisons be provided for review and that new cross-sections be accommodated within existing standard ROW widths. o It is unclear how the TMP ROW cross-sections interface with the cross-sections in Chapter 3 of CodeSMTX, why there are slight variations between the two, and why there would be a need for two different sets of standards. o Recommend that the same ROW cross-sections for the TMP and CodeSMTX be used and not duplicated. o Bus routes and stops for both CARTS and TXST are not represented on any of the plans, showing a lack of concurrent multimodal planning and making it more of a ROW master plan than a true Transportation Master Plan. o Recommend adding a fourth "Public Transit Plan" map to ensure that public transportation is part of this planning effort. o Outside of summary presentations and the three proposed plans, it does not appear that a full report has been posted for Public Review, making it difficult to understand the intent and timeline of the TMP, as well as its fulfillment of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. o Recommend revising the adoption timeline to allow for the release of a complete TMP document with a 60-day public comment period before voting on the adoption of the TMP. Throughfare Plan and Associated Cross Sections • A wide-flung network of ring roads throughout the entire ETJ (notably in the SE quadrant and the proposed NW Loop and Craddock Extension) encourage agricultural and natural land conversion to low-density sprawl. This proliferation of ETJ roads is antithetical to the concept of "compact and connected growth," and showing these roads with equal emphasis as roads within the existing City Limits on the plan conflicts with the goals of the Preferred Scenario Map embedded within the Comprehensive Plan. o Recommend removing the excessive ring roads from the Thoroughfare Plan and placing emphasis instead on growth and improvements that reinforce the Preferred Scenario Map. o Several important roads that run through the existing City are currently owned by TXDOT which creates conflicts in objectives - but no distinction is noted in the TMP plans for these roads nor timeframes for the City to take over their ownership. Further, some of these core roads are noted in Capital Improvement Projects as being prioritized for "capacity enhancements" which conflict with the goals of creating Complete Streets, as well as citizen desires. o Recommend distinguishing TXDOT-owned thoroughfares and outlining a plan for eventual City control; and eliminating capacity enhancement projects for roads that run through the existing city core and instead focus resources in these areas on Complete Street conversions and speed reductions for safety, liveability. o Additional cross-section comments: o Recommend reducing proposed lane widths to 10' for 35 mph and less roadways to improve safety, as well as reduce impervious cover. o Recommend adding cross-sections to both the TMP and CodeSMTX that incorporate stormwater biofilters / retention in ROW versus typical crowned vegetated strips. Bike Plan • As noted in my previous comments, the plan lacks connected and dedicated bike lanes in large portions of the existing town. I am reemphasizing this point as these missing routes are critical for shorter, in-town commuter routes versus the plan's current focus on long-distance, regional routes and recreational shared-use trails / greenways. Studies show that dedicated bike lanes are critical to increasing bike ridership (such as this report) and particularly for women (as shown in this report). o Recommend adding dedicated and connected bike lane routes through existing neighborhoods throughout town, such as along Bishop, Craddock, RR12, Holland, Hopkins, Hunter, MLK, LBJ, Stagecoach, River Road, Thorpe, Mill, etc. o The plan shows an over-dependence on sharrows instead of protected and/or buffered bike lanes. Sharrows do not increase safety or ridership (as noted in this report) and a review of speed/volume relationship to bike facilities per TMP presentation materials indicates a need for bike lanes on roadways with speeds of 18.5 to 35 mph. o Recommend utilizing protected bike lanes or at least buffered bike lanes on connected, dedicated bike routes to increase bike safety, awareness and ridership	Public involvement is minimal in developing TMP Revise Maps including Bike and Greenways Include Transit Plan Coordinate TMP with other City Departments Include more protected bike lanes Include more pedestrian connections Greenways and Bike Plan will be revised as per the comments provided. a layer with natural areas will be added to the plan Maps will be revised to differentiate various facilities with contrast colors Once TMP plans are finalized, copies will be provided at various locations including SM Library Car/Ride sharing assumptions were used to develop the traffic model. Transit plan was not included in the planning process. Bike and Pedestrian plan in included in the TMP. Greenways provide pedestrian connections and bike plan provides proposed bike facilities with COSM Other City departments were consulted to provide feedback on the proposed plan. coordination with Planning & Development department was key in the development of TMP plans and cross sections. CodeSMTX and TMP were integrated to develop a comprehensive plan Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirements. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement. as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop
				I hear the new transportation plan includes new roads upstream of Spring Lake near Sink Springs and Rattlesnake Cave. Please do not do this as it will jeopardize the clarity and cleanliness of Spring Lake and the San Marcos River. Roads generate dirt, rubber debris, oil spilling, etc. which rain will wash into the lake and river. Road locations must be carefully studied to keep this con-tamination out of our beautiful river. Water from Rattlesnake Cave and Sink Springs has been studied by TSU aquatic biologists and found to end up in Spring Lake. We cannot do things that encourage this contamination. Please!	against Craddock Extension/other roadway on Edwards Aquifer
				Improve Old RR 12 between Franklin and Holland for bicycles. Add bicycle share lane to rightmost lane or improve road for bicycles on Holland, Academy and Sessom at least to LBJ. I support the Trails Plan and the associated costs. Franklin was recently resurfaced. As a cyclist, I feel that the road is now WORSE than it was before resurfacing. I am very unhappy with the quality of this work and hope whoever did this job receives greater oversight in the future if thwy are ever allowed to procede with future projects.	

		Revise Maps including Bike and Greenways Include more protected bike lanes Include more pedestrian connections
	the City adopted a complete street policy and all existing cross sections were updated to include multimodal characteristics. lane widths were discussed in detail with all City departments and based on the emergency management requirements a min lane width of 11' was recommended for cross sections with 35MPH	
	a bike plan was developed by obtaining input from bike advisory group as well as existing ROW available along various roadways. a buffered bike lane is provided along corridors where there is additional lane capacity available to provide a bike lane. A sharrow is provided along the corridors where no additional lane is available and traffic demand is high.	
	Greenways and Bike Plan will be revised as per the comments provided. a layer with natural areas will be added to the plan. Maps will be revised to differentiate various facilities with contrast colors	
	Once TMP plans are finalized, copies will be provided at various locations including SM Library	
	Car/Ride sharing assumptions were used to develop the traffic model. Transit plan was not included in the planning process. Bike and Pedestrian plan included in the TMP. Greenways provide pedestrian connections and bike plan provides proposed bike facilities with COSM	
	Other City departments were consulted to provide feedback on the proposed plan. coordination with Planning & Development department was key in the development of TMP plans and cross sections. CodeSMTX and TMP were integrated to develop a comprehensive plan	
	Bike plan will be revised to use different colors for various facilities proposed. sharrowes were used on residential streets and on facilities where there is no ROW available to accomodate bike lane and where vehicular traffic takes precedence	
		ag
	Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirments. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement.	
	as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop	
	Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirements. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement.	against Craddock Extension
	as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop	
		Issue with a Proposed Trail
	NA	
	Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirements. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement.	against Craddock Extension
	as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop	
	as above Lime Kiln Rd extension shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirments. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement.	against Craddock Extension Issue with the proposed Lime Kiln Road Alignment
	Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirments. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement.	against Craddock Extension
	as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop	
	Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirements. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement.	against Craddock Extension
	as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop	
	a 10' shared suse path is proposed along Sessom from N LBJ to Alamo	Issue with a Proposed Trail
	no studies have been conducted to identify the number of cyclists using roadways. Bike plan illustrates proposed infrastructure to encourage cyclists to use existing roadways	exclude bike infrastructure
	Craddock Extension and West Loop location shown on the plan is a representative location and can be shifted farther west based on the requirements. The final alignemnt will be developed during PER process with public involvement.	against Craddock Extension
	as per the traffic model, Craddock extension and West Loop are required to accommodate traffic growth anticipated in future; and to alleviate congestion along Hopkins, Sessom, RM 12 and Wonder World Dr. the proposed roadways shown on thoroughfare plan doesn't necessarily mean that it will be constructed in future and at the location proposed. It only provides the opportunity to protect ROWs in case a development is proposed within the area. whether these roadways are required will be analyzed at a later stage. In addition Council has approved the thoroughfare plan with Craddock and West Loop	

1. I'm worried about the proposed road that would run by Sink Creek. How would the watershed be affected (or damaged)? How would Spring Lake be impacted? 2. How does Texas State plan to expand and occupy more of San Marcos?	
N Craddock Extension - 1. Environmentally sensitive area. 2. Goes below the last dam so no filtration of runoff before Spring Lake. 3. 10 years ago - conversations between Wimberley and San Marcos Transportation Committees said Wimberley peoplee don't come to SM to go north on I 35, they go down 150. So look at 150 plans and they should bear a lot of the load.	
Concerns about trail plan from 5-mile dam park north to Kiwana's Camp. Current plan shows trailing going through middle of our property. Trespassing and safety is already an issue from park goers. This would escalate the problem. Please consider alternatives.	
I like the trails & fruit trees that will be planted. I like the plans for bike paths. The Craddock extension will not be good for the river. It will contaminate the aquifer. We need to put the northern loop somewher else. The Craddock extension will be a disaster! The Craddock extension and all plans for "so-called" loops on the west side of town need to be removed from the transportation plan.	
Please eliminate the Craddock extension from the Transportation Plan. It is bad for the river.	
1. The county is presently planning to spend \$3M raises the bridges on Lime Kiln. The City and County need to get a joint plan before money is wasted. 2. Present loop from Lime Kiln Rd to Post goes through the calence (sp?) pitt (not feasible). 3. My land is under a federal easement cutting through it would be difficult. I can work with you on routing that makes sense. 4. Drainage from up Lime Kiln needs to be diverted into the word pitt to filter the water before it gets in Sink Creek. I would be delighted to give a tour.	
	</