

Joelle Sierra

From: Bob McKechnie [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2009 1:08 AM
To: 281SuperStreet
Subject: Super Street Comment

Sir-

In your comments about the original US281 overpass plan, you allude to a wrong fact. That plan did have frontage roads and ramps for the freeway overpass system. You are misleading the people.

I don't think that spending over \$8 million to save 15 or so minutes in travel time from Marshall Road to 1604 is worth it. In fact I don't believe that the superstreet will save any time. It will just create more frustration and confusion.

Look at the traffic congestion caused on Evans Road by the present work to add an additional right turn lane.

In my opinion, the only true fix for US281 is the original plan from before 2000 that had overpasses, frontage roads and ramps.

This superstreet will be a disaster!

Sincerely,
Robert McKechnie
[REDACTED]
San Antonio, TX 78260
[REDACTED]

Joelle Sierra

From: Tony & Missy Northington [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2009 12:17 PM
To: Alamo RMA Community Relations
Subject: 281 super street

Why haven't we seen any progress on the 281 super street? I figured you were waiting for lighter traffic patterns since school would be ending, but still nothing is happening! You already got the green light several months ago, and green means GO!

Joelle Sierra

From: Clare Eastland-Villarreal [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2009 8:45 AM
To: Alamo RMA Community Relations
Subject: 281 Superstreet

I am one of the many commuters that suffer through the 281 drive each day (from Canyon Lake to Sonterra Blvd) – I will not be able to attend the open house but I am wondering when can we expect the construction on the Superstreet to start?

Any help to reduce congestion would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks very much.

[Clare Eastland-Villarreal](#)

Joelle Sierra

From: Bobby & June Cox [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2009 12:36 PM
To: 281SuperStreet
Subject: Traffic Signal Timing

One of the biggest causes of congestion on 281 are the traffic signals that are not timed to allow traffic to move. The green time is too short on 281 to allow the traffic backup to clear. San Antonio would do well to look at how Orlando, FL moves traffic on state hwy. 436. They are experts on traffic signal timing. Traffic used to be a nightmare and moved slowly, but with new timing and with dual left turn lanes, traffic moves fairly well. Wake up San Antonio, you can do much better!

Joelle Sierra

From: LINEBERGER & ASSOCIATES [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2009 5:15 PM
To: 281SuperStreet
Cc: 'Samira Lineberger'
Subject: Comments-281 Superstreet

Just a few questions:

1. Is it true that the design of a super-street median crossover is similar to that of a median U-turn crossover? I understand that crossovers should be located approximately 180 m (600 ft) from a "main intersection". Will the current U. S. 281 right of way accommodate minimum median widths of 18 m (60 ft) as required by semi-trailer combination vehicles? Will accommodating semi-trailer operations reduce usable traffic lane widths? Please explain.
2. Is it true that the traditional superstreet "non-offset" design may not be appropriate for crossroads with relatively higher through volumes? Evans Road and Stone Oak Pkwy/TPC Pkwy are by any reasonable assessment "relatively high through volume" crossover streets. What are your proposed intersection design alternatives at these two crossover nodes?
3. Is it true that the proposed "superstreet design" can result in more stops for through vehicles than for other more traditional intersection designs? Can it create out-of-direction travel for cross street through and left-turn movements? Can this limit their traffic capacity and increase traffic travel times? While left turns from the major road experience less delay, it appears that crossroad delays may increase. What does the collected data/analysis show?
4. Is it true that simulation studies (as published by FHWA) using a range of intersection configurations (number of through lanes on the major and minor street) and volumes from intersections in Virginia and North Carolina suggest mixed results in overall travel time through the intersection when compared to a conventional intersection (- 8 to +18 percent during off-peak conditions, and -10 to +71 percent during peak conditions)? Is it true that the same studies also show a substantial increase in the overall percent of stops when compared to a conventional intersection (-8 to +187 percent during off-peak conditions, and +16 to +146 percent during peak conditions)? Please explain.
5. Is it true that superstreet designs can produce increased driver and pedestrian confusion? What kind of orientation is planned to assure proper driver preparation before opening each re-designed intersection?
6. Is it true that the proposed superstreet strategy potential liabilities (Longer travel distance and time for minor street movements, Two-stage pedestrian crossing, Potential way-finding challenges, Wide median needed, Potential for driver and pedestrian confusion) outweigh its potential benefits (Fewer conflict points, Improved delay for major street movements)? Please explain. What do the publicly available data, analysis, and documented traffic studies or impact analysis show?

Thanks in advance.

--

Jeffery L. Lineberger, P. E.
LINEBERGER & ASSOCIATES
19141 Stone Oak Parkway #104
San Antonio, Texas 78258
Office: 866.440.0000
[REDACTED]

URL: <http://www.structuralsciences.com> Linked In Profile:
[REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY INFORMATION NOTICE The information transmitted herein is intended solely for the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material, information or data. Any and all use, review, alteration, transmission, dissemination or other unauthorized use of or reliance upon of this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please contact the originator/sender and permanently delete the material/data/information from any and all digital storage media, including audio, video, or hard copy.

Joelle Sierra

From: Maria H. Ferrier Ed.D. [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, July 04, 2009 5:47 PM
To: 281SuperStreet
Subject: Super Street Comment-we want relief now

We want relief now. If the super street is a temporary fix, let's call it that and do it now. I am afraid from watching other highway projects that we will study this to death, spend tons of time on frivolous lawsuits, and get nothing done for at least the next ten years. I don't know what idiot politician thought it would be acceptable to run a freeway into one of the fastest growing areas or our city and send that freeway to a stop light. This was unacceptable from the beginning and it must be fixed now. By the way those same idiot politicians are doing the same thing on the other side of town with 1604 going from a freeway to a stoplight. Plan, move, get going. Now.

Thanks for your time,
Thomas Marshall
[REDACTED]

Joelle Sierra

From: Christopher Deeves [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2009 12:23 PM
To: 281SuperStreet

I understand the concept of superstreet and dividing up movement. I think this makes sense from an engineering standpoint (if the studies bear this out) for the intersections at Evans and Stone Oak. However, when 99.5% of the traffic on Encino Rio is turning left and the NB and SB lanes will have to be stopped the same amount of time as before to move this traffic across how is there any time savings or costs savings to doing that intersection. Also, can the trucks entering the cement plant pull off a u-turn when heading NB. I think doing any "superstreet" improvement is a complete waste at Encino Rio. If there is a model supporting that design for that type of three way intersection with all the traffic on the side street moving in one direction I would like to see it. The pape-dawson engineer at the stone oak community meeting could not explain any benefit to doing Encino Rio. I think the same is true for Marshall as well, but to a lesser extent. Honestly, I don't see how you can fit the turns in the footprint at Marshall since there is no additional right of way.

Also, if double left turns can be added at Evans under this project has the model been run with those in place and extending a third lane NB on 281 between Evans and Stone Oak and can NB pavement be repaved to add such a lane. Can on SB 281, a right turn lane at Stone Oak be added and then continue 3 SB lane thru the intersection. I asked at whitehouse.gov but got no answer. Has the possibility of doing that been explored? It seems much less costly. Has those three minor design changes been run against a "superstreet"? What about doing these interim fixes that already fit with the changes on Evans.

I would then use the money to extend Hardy Oak from the end of Stuebing Ranch to Stone Oak which is not funded, but that would be a permanent benefit.

Thank you.

Chris Deeves
[REDACTED]

Joelle Sierra

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2009 1:03 PM
To: 281SuperStreet
Subject: Ref new proposal

This new superstreet idea has been tried in several other states. Los Angeles tried it in the 1960s. It did not work, increased accidents when cars tried to get over to the left turn lane and increased time for oncoming traffic to turn left or right.

The Regional Mobil Authority board needs to look at the history of this concept before implementing it at the taxpayers cost.

Regards,

Allen R Moore
[REDACTED]

Make your summer sizzle with [fast and easy recipes](#) for the grill.

Joelle Sierra

From: Roberts, Brian [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2009 3:08 PM
To: Alamo RMA Community Relations
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Traffic lights

I must have been erroneously informed, but it was my understanding that there would be some traffic lights taken down with the new Super Street. However, I am noticing that an additional 4 more lights will be added. I am confused on how more traffic lights will decrease the drive time between Marshall and 1604. It seems that the traffic lights are a major part of the problem. Wouldn't the drive time practically double?

I'm copying my home email address just in case my emails are blocked here at work.

Brian Roberts

Privileged/Confidential Information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to such person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information expressed in this message are not given or endorsed by Warm Springs Rehabilitation System unless otherwise indicated by an authorized representative independent of this message.

Joelle Sierra

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2009 11:46 AM
To: Alamo RMA Community Relations
Subject: Timing of Traffic Lights at Evans Rd. and Hwy. 281

I do not believe the statement that traffic lights were not adjusted to make matters worse as exhibited by the quote:

"At rush hour or peak traffic times, capacity simply overwhelms the function of the traffic signals and no amount of adjustment will make a significant difference. "

There can be no other reason that the traffic lights going east to west or west to east from Evans Rd. to 281 should allow only 3 or 4 cars to turn north or south than that they are set to do so. There will be continued accidents (and potential deaths) at that intersection if that problem is not adjusted soon. At the very least, about 8 to 10 cars used to be able to travel east on Evans Rd. to Hwy. 281 or cross the intersection to the west side of 281. That is no longer the case. At many times during the day (not just "rush hour or peak traffic times") I have watched the 4th, 5th, or 6th cars 'run' the yellow or even the red light because the light is set to let only 3 or maybe 4 cars through.

I have called in a complaint to 311 numerous times because the change has been very obvious, but it seems no one values human life enough to get it fixed. Additionally, my sister, who just moved down here recently from Plano and is looking for a home in the north central corridor, has to pay \$9 more per month on her car insurance because "the area she moved into is a higher risk area for accidents." It is ridiculous and ludicrous to think that she moved from Plano (a Dallas suburb) to San Antonio and has to pay more for car insurance just because she wants to move to the north central area to be closer to most of her family.

The poor timing of the lights used to be the same way at the intersection of Encino Rio and 281, but they seem to have since figured out that similar situation and fixed it. Now they need to do the same thing at Evans and 281 or the accidents (and deaths) will increase before the so-called "Superstreet" is even started.

I also would like to know why the environmental clearance that was given to expand 281 was retracted due to a lawsuit. This was not clarified in anything I've read on your web site. Please explain in detail.

Thank you for your time.

Bonnie Garcia
Evans Ranch Homeowner

Make your summer sizzle with [fast and easy recipes](#) for the grill.

Joelle Sierra

From: Clint Wynn [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2009 10:07 AM
To: 281SuperStreet
Subject: June 30th 281 Meeting

I unfortunately will be unable to attend this evenings meeting; however would like to say that as a resident of the Stone Oak area I am in complete support of the super street concept or even toll roads. Relieving the congestion in this area is a must and it is unfortunate that we have allowed special interest groups to litigate in a way that has prevented an earlier solution.

Sincerely,

Clint Wynn
[REDACTED]

San Antonio, TX 78258

Joelle Sierra

From: Carl Poole [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2009 12:34 AM
To: 281SuperStreet
Subject: 281 superstreet?

From the superstreet plan all I can see is additional intersections and it looks confusing. I was surprised to see that a roundabout intersection wasn't considered anywhere on the website. That would eliminate all traffic signals and accommodates all types of turns and through traffic. Why wasn't this considered? It is a lot less confusing than a 'superstreet'.

Carl.