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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) unifies the City’s existing plans and brings them up-to-date and in line with the City of Fredericksburg’s transportation priorities set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. It acts as a lens through which to evaluate projects and implementation strategies with these priorities in mind. The TMP is a framework that helps the City to balance trade-offs that are central to transportation planning. Some examples of these challenges include integrating the bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and automobile networks, resolving local issues with regional impacts in mind, and retaining historic character while also preserving right-of-way to accommodate future growth.

The TMP provides an overview of the existing transportation networks and traffic volume trends in Fredericksburg. It also includes an assessment of local and regional transportation concerns and documents existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. One of the primary issues facing Fredericksburg today is increased noise, congestion, and safety concerns along Main Street due to truck traffic. The designation of Main Street as US 290 amplifies the competing interests between pedestrians and pass-through traffic. Distinguished regionally by its manifold tourist attractions, the City also faces the challenge of meeting the diverse transportation needs of both residents and tourists.

This plan recommends solutions for current transportation challenges in Fredericksburg. To help address the competing interests on Main Street and fluctuations in need, signal timing strategies are evaluated. Alternative cross-sections for civic streets in the historic district, including Main Street, and two-way to one-way street conversions are detailed to reimagine existing space. Ideas for transit solutions for the area, including regional shuttles and on-demand transit services, are explored to help serve underserved populations. Thinking beyond the automobile mode, recommendations are made for infrastructure improvements for the bicycle and pedestrian network.

Funding and implementation make a plan actionable. The following implementation strategies are provided by this plan:

- **Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Ranking Tool**
  - A prioritization tool was established for the City to rank CIP projects based on the goals identified by this plan. The CIP ranking tool uses a points-based system of performance measures and includes cost estimates for current and new CIP projects.

- **Truck Relief Route**
  - The TMP includes recommended next steps for design and construction of the proposed truck relief route that help enhance Main Street as a destination.

- **Project Funding**
  - An overview of project funding sources that are currently in place is provided. Additional funding sources are explored to expand the City’s access to transportation solutions.

The TMP accomplishes its purpose of unifying existing planning efforts and establishing a set of identifiable, measurable goals with which to evaluate projects in the CIP. The plan recommends solutions to the existing transportation needs for Fredericksburg and identifies funding sources to implement these solutions. Lastly, the plan is well informed by the citizens of Fredericksburg, City staff, and councilmembers to ensure that it is a product of the people.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Role of the Transportation Master Plan

The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) guides transportation policy and project prioritization to help the local multimodal transportation system conform to community priorities. It also provides recommendations for implementation and funding strategies.

The TMP is a high-level view of the city's transportation network. It is a compendium of available information and updates the Thoroughfare Plan to reflect changes since that plan's adoption. Data from previously adopted plans is aggregated into a single framework.

This plan, along with the updated Thoroughfare Plan, serves as the primary tool to enable the City to preserve future corridors and right-of-way as the city develops and to improve the existing street network as needs arise. The TMP also provides the ability to integrate networks of other modes, including walking, bicycling, and transit. This plan guides future City investments and provides the community with information about the long-term plan for the transportation network. It is a blueprint for a safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation system. It creates a system that balances local and regional priorities and steers the City towards its vision for the future.

Study Elements

This plan consists of the following study elements:

- **Chapter 2: Transportation Planning Framework**
  - This chapter describes the foundation of the plan, which includes planning goals established by the City, previous and concurrent local plans, and the public input process.

- **Chapter 3: Existing Conditions**
  - This chapter provides an overview of the existing transportation system in Fredericksburg, including demographics, traffic volumes, the active transportation network for pedestrians and bicyclists, and local planning constraints.

- **Chapter 4: Historic District**
  - This chapter focuses on the historic downtown area of Fredericksburg and the challenges unique to a corridor that serves as both a destination and a major thoroughfare. It provides an inventory of existing issues, descriptions of best practices, and specific recommendations for the City, especially regarding pedestrian safety and comfort.

- **Chapter 5: Regional Impacts and Concerns**
  - This chapter describes and analyzes critical challenges in the Fredericksburg region, including the proposed truck relief route, transit, and access to major activity centers.
• Chapter 6: Transportation Master Plan Development
  – The chapter describes the process undertaken to create this TMP and update the Thoroughfare Plan in alignment with the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

• Chapter 7: Recommendations and Implementation
  – This chapter discusses the creation of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) project ranking tool developed as a part of this TMP to prioritize transportation funding in alignment with the City’s goals and objectives.

• Chapter 8: Project Funding
  – This chapter outlines current transportation funding practices in Fredericksburg and describes possible alternative funding sources.
CHAPTER 2: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FRAMEWORK

High level goals determined by the Council, City staff, and local stakeholders have guided the development of this Transportation Master Plan. The plan also rests on a foundation created by previous planning efforts, public involvement, and workshops with City staff, council members, and other stakeholders.

Goals and Objectives

City staff participated in an eight-hour workshop to establish and rank goals for the Transportation Master Plan. These goals were presented in a public open house and then further refined in a workshop with City Council. The CIP Prioritization Tool (discussed in Chapter 7: Implementation and Recommendations) contains concrete performance measures for each of the objectives as listed below:

- **Congestion Mitigation** - prioritize projects that maximize the efficiency of vehicular travel within the roadway network.
- **Safety & Welfare** - provide a transportation system safe for all users and secure against natural disasters.
- **Connectivity** - enhance access and connectivity across the community as well as to specific land uses along a corridor for all modes of transportation.
- **Mobility** - maximize the mobility of all modes within the roadway network while maintaining access to key destinations.
- **Implementation** - prioritize projects that are shovel-ready and have demonstrated support among all project sponsors.
- **Community Character** - prioritize projects in areas where investments will enhance the existing unique community character and create new patterns for development.

Previous Plans

The TMP project team leveraged the work completed in the City’s previously adopted plans, supplementing and augmenting those project and policy recommendations to create this plan. These previous planning efforts are summarized in the following section.
Comprehensive Plan
Created in 2006 “as a guide toward a vision of what the community should retain and what the community can ultimately become,”¹ the Comprehensive Plan incorporates five main elements:

- Livability
- Land Use
- Growth
- Transportation
- Parks and Recreation

The following mobility goals from the Comprehensive Plan pertain directly to this Transportation Master Plan:

- Goal 34: A range of mobility choices available to Fredericksburg residents, business employees, and visitors.
- Goal 35: A network of sidewalks, trails, paths, and designated lanes that allows residents to walk or bicycle within neighborhoods, to and within the Central Business District, and to other key locations.
- Goal 36: A street system and related facilities that provide adequate capacity for vehicular traffic (cars, public transportation and trucks) in Fredericksburg and that is compatible with its surroundings.
- Goal 38: Adequate levels of transportation facilities and services available to existing development and to new development when it is occupied.

A 2015 Issues Update to the Comprehensive Plan provides:

- A Sidewalk Plan to be referenced by the City’s Subdivision Ordinance, Section 6.11.B.1., so that all new subdivisions must include the construction of sidewalks identified by the Plan.
- A Gateways Plan that identifies six entrances to Fredericksburg that should enhance the City’s character. The Plan describes design standards for the gateways and unique concept plans for each gateway that should be considered as redevelopment occurs.

¹ 2006 Comprehensive Plan, City of Fredericksburg
Sidewalk Plan

The City of Fredericksburg Sidewalk Plan, developed in June 2015, includes existing and proposed sidewalks. The City uses the Sidewalk Plan to specify sidewalk improvements for each fiscal year. The sidewalk plan is maintained by the City in a GIS format to plan for future sidewalk projects. The Comprehensive Plan provides guidance for project prioritization with recommendations for high, medium, and low priority areas for sidewalks.
Developed in 2006, the Thoroughfare Plan designates existing and proposed thoroughfares of varying classifications in the City of Fredericksburg, including trails and outer loop alternatives. As part of the development of this TMP, the Thoroughfare Plan was updated to include recently constructed roads and to account for current transportation needs and constraints.

Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
The CIP includes present needs and a 20-year projection of future needs, including fiscal requirements. The CIP is updated annually to show planned projects over the next five years, as well as a projection of unfunded needs beyond the five-year horizon.
Parks, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan

The City’s Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan was adopted in March 2016. It provides a ten-year action plan and priority list of recommendations for future park acquisition based on perceived community needs.

Zoning Map

The City’s zoning map was last revised in July 2016. The primary purpose of zoning is to put land to the use for which it is best suited. Another purpose is to protect or maintain property values by separating non-compatible land uses. It provides for a more orderly development as the city grows. A copy of the most recent zoning map can be found on the City of Fredericksburg’s website.
The Gillespie County Relief Route Preliminary Report was published in November 2015. In 2016 a corresponding Fact Sheet was released. The Relief Route Preliminary Report provides recommendations for the Relief Route Task Force to move forward towards right-of-way acquisition for and construction of the truck relief route. This relief route is discussed further in Chapter 5: Regional Impacts and Concerns.
Parking Study
Parking is a critical element for commercial land uses, particularly in the downtown area. The City of Fredericksburg is currently conducting a study of parking availability and utilization. This study will examine the feasibility of parking alternatives to better provide an adequate number of spaces for citizens, employees, and visitors. This report will be available on the City’s website once it is complete.

Public Input
An important component of Fredericksburg’s Transportation Master Plan process was the identification and integration of the community’s transportation priorities, which acted as a guide for the development of the plan. Instead of addressing limited components of the network with a focus only on vehicular movement, current transportation planning best practices include improving the efficiency of the system in ways that promote the community’s values. The public input process was designed to encourage involvement from a broad spectrum of residents, business owners, and community leaders.
January 20, 2017 Workshop

A detailed workshop with major City departments was conducted early in the development of this plan. The workshop established goals and objectives for the TMP and began the development of a tool that staff can use to prioritize transportation projects in their Capital Improvement Plan.

In the morning session, City staff gathered to develop goals and priorities for CIP project prioritization. This workshop included discussions of existing issues in Fredericksburg and attributes of an ideal transportation system for the City. Staff members and stakeholders also participated in a variety of activities to rank nine potential goals for the TMP.

The priorities that emerged from these conversations and the goals from the 2006 Comprehensive Plan were used to develop the goals and objectives for the prioritizing the CIP.

In the afternoon session, over 50 community members attended an open house at City Hall. Informational boards presented attendees with information about existing plans and the role of the Transportation Master Plan.

Attendees also took part in a budget exercise where they were invited to allocate a sample city transportation budget to key infrastructure improvements of varying linear costs, including road widenings, bike lanes, sidewalks, and multiuse trails. Over the course of the open house, a map was built showing the chosen investments of each participant.
March 6, 2017 Staff and Council Workshop
On March 6, 2017, a staff workshop and a subsequent council workshop were held to refine the CIP Prioritization Tool and the draft 2017 Thoroughfare Plan.

June 19, 2017 Council Workshop #2
A presentation was made to the City Council on June 19, 2017 to obtain input on the preliminary findings and Draft TMP Report.
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Founded by German settlers in 1846, the City of Fredericksburg is located in Gillespie County in the Texas hill country. The city boasts a unique heritage that attracts tens of thousands of visitors annually and provides an environment for residents that is rich with local culture and attractions. Shopping, dining, live music, wineries, and festivals serve as the main attractions for both residents and tourists.

With 23 hotels and motels, 400 bed and breakfasts, and 9 RV parks and campgrounds, the area has a potential capacity for over 5,700 overnight guests. In 2015, the Enchanted Rock State Natural Area’s attendance was over 290,000 visitors, and the Convention and Visitor Bureau’s Visitor Information Center assisted 61,765 visitors.

Demographics & Employment

The quickly changing demographic and economic growth conditions in the Central Texas region is one of the primary reasons to develop the City of Fredericksburg’s Transportation Master Plan and stay ahead of future travel demands.

Fredericksburg had an estimated population of 10,826 in 2015, with a median age of 52. The city has experienced steady growth of approximately 100 residents per year (or 1% growth) since 2010, when the total population was 10,363. Gillespie County had a total population of 25,398 in 2015. With new residents and economic development continuing to surge into the region, Fredericksburg will face critical decisions about how to accommodate the increase in trips both locally and regionally.

Tourist populations have a substantial impact on Fredericksburg’s vehicular and pedestrian traffic volumes. Two thirds of visitors stay overnight, taking advantage of the region’s vast array of bed-and-breakfasts and inns, while one third are day trippers, perhaps in town to enjoy local wineries, hiking, or historic sites.

Highway System

Fredericksburg is served by three major highway systems:

- US 290 is a major arterial that serves vehicular traffic traveling to and from the Austin area to the east, and connects to I-10 about 40 miles west of the city. To the east of Fredericksburg, US 290 is a 60-mph four-lane highway with a center turn lane. Upon entering the city, the speed limit drops to 40 mph just west of Walmart Drive, then 30 mph at Elk Street and through the downtown area, where US 290 becomes Main Street, a five-lane cross-section with four travel lanes, left turn lanes, sidewalks, and angled on-street parking. West of downtown, the speed limit is 45 mph between Bowie Street and through the US 87 intersection. West of the city, it returns to a four-lane undivided highway with a speed limit of 70 mph.

---

3 2015 Annual Report, Fredericksburg Convention and Visitor Bureau
4 American Community Survey Data Profiles, American Fact Finder, United States Census Bureau
5 2013 Annual Report, Fredericksburg Convention and Visitor Bureau
State Highway 16 is a 55-mph four-lane undivided major arterial that extends to the northeast and southwest of Fredericksburg. Within the city limits, the speed limit is 35 mph, increasing to 50 mph north of Lower Crabapple Road and 45 mph south of Live Oak to Friendship Lane. Many Fredericksburg residents use SH 16 to commute to and from work in Kerrville to the south. Within the city, it is known south of Main Street as S Adams Street and north of Main Street as N Llano Street.

US 87 is an undivided major arterial that extends to the north of the city as a two-lane cross-section and to the south as a four-lane cross-section. Traffic to and from San Antonio to the south of the city uses US 87. US 87 has a speed limit of 70 mph south of the city, which drops to 35 north of Hwy Street. North of downtown, US 87 splits off from Main Street (US 290) with a speed limit of 55 mph, which increases to 70 mph north of Balcones Drive.

Thoroughfare Network

The Thoroughfare Plan identifies designated arterials, collectors, civic streets, and trails. The 2017 update to the Thoroughfare Plan is discussed in detail in Chapter 6: Transportation Master Plan Development.

Fredericksburg’s thoroughfares serve two typical functions: commuter routes to downtown, and circulation routes within downtown. Key thoroughfares for Fredericksburg commuters accessing the downtown area include:

- Main Street
- Adams Street
- Milam Street
- Llano Street
- Cherry Street
- Washington Street
- Lower Crabapple Road

Thoroughfares that serve as circulation routes within downtown include:

- Main Street
- San Antonio Street
- Austin Street

Traffic Volume Trends

Historical Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes provide information on traffic patterns on Fredericksburg’s roadway network and can provide insight into how the network performs.

Fredericksburg’s historic downtown is marked by vibrant economic activity including museums, historical sites, and popular shopping and dining destinations. Most visitors arrive from the south and east, particularly from San Antonio and Houston, Texas, making it unsurprising that Main Street (US 290) east of SH 16 experiences the highest daily traffic volumes in the city.

Field observations and historical traffic data yield the following additional traffic volume trends:

- Main Street volumes exceed 20,000 vehicles per day.
- Main Street travel speeds are approximately 20 mph through downtown on weekdays and slow to 10 mph during heavy tourist events.

6 2013 Annual Report, Fredericksburg Convention and Visitor Bureau
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- Traffic volumes on US 87 south and west of downtown, US 290 west of downtown, and SH 16 north and south of downtown range from 5,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day.
- Collectors like Live Oak Street, Post Oak Road, Highway Street, and Adams Street have volumes ranging from 2,000 to 7,000 vehicles per day within city limits.
- The daily volumes of nearby local streets range from less than 100 to approximately 1,500 vehicles per day.\(^7\)

Historical data shows that major roadways within Fredericksburg have experienced a significant increase in traffic volumes since 2010 as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Count Location</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Annual Growth Rate</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 290</td>
<td>E of 1631</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>20,723</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E of 87 S</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>19,591</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E of 16 N</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>20,668</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 16 N and 16 S</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>16,783</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 16 S and 965</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>15,242</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W of 965</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14,734</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S of US 87 W</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 16</td>
<td>N of Main Street</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S of Main Street</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>11,402</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 965</td>
<td>N of Main Street</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Broadmoor Drive</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>8,168</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2013 Alternate Truck Route Analysis noted that on Main Street “within 5-6 years the average daily traffic flow (will) exceed capacity.”\(^8\) In addition to traffic delays, the following impacts of this trend were considered likely:

- Increased vehicular and pedestrian crash rates, as frustrated drivers exceed the speed limit to make up for delays caused by congestion
- Increased emergency response times
- Increased traffic spillover into adjacent residential neighborhoods
- Negative effect on local economic development

The Hazardous Material Commodity Flow Study conducted by the City in 2012 observed that during business hours, a large truck passes through downtown approximately once every minute, creating congestion and negatively impacting the idyllic downtown atmosphere for residents and visitors. The need for a truck relief route is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5: Regional Impacts and Concerns.

---

\(^7\) [2015 Austin Urban Traffic Map, TxDOT Transportation Planning and Programming Division]

\(^8\) [Alternate Truck Route Analysis, Walter Ragsdale, 2013]
Bicycle & Pedestrian System

A city’s active transportation network is intended to provide transportation alternatives and recreational opportunities for people of all ages and abilities. The installation of pedestrian and bicycle facilities can be the most visible element of a city’s multimodal transportation network. It shows that the community is a welcoming place for non-motorized trip choices and supports the safe use of streets by all road users.

The use of sidewalks, trails, and bicycles is a transportation choice that benefits personal health, reduces traffic congestion and air pollution, and enhances quality of life by creating opportunities for cost savings and social interaction. Interest in bicycling for commuting or recreation is increasing, but many novice riders do not feel comfortable riding on-street with traffic. Concerns about safety, barriers, and lack of infrastructure often lead people to continue using cars for short trips. Increased bicycle and pedestrian facility choices not only address safety concerns, but enhance long-term community livability, create welcoming streets and neighborhoods, and strengthen local economic competitiveness.

As part of the TMP planning effort, the local bicycling community was engaged to determine the best possible routes within the city for cyclists based on existing recreational and commuting patterns. The most popular existing routes were compiled in a map, and this map was circulated among the local bicycling community for comment. Just because a route is shown on the map does not mean the routes are endorsed for safety, but if these routes are included in a roadway project, it is recommended that bike facilities be considered. A map of these routes is provided in the Appendix.

Parking System

Given Fredericksburg’s strong identity as a thriving economic center and destination for both locals and visitors, the demand for parking in downtown has been an ongoing issue. The majority of downtown streets allow on-street parking, with many streets providing designated parallel or angled parking adjacent to businesses.
CHAPTER 4: HISTORIC DISTRICT

This chapter provides focused guidance about how to adapt civic streets within the historic downtown area to better meet the unique transportation needs of the district and to support the development and economic goals of the historic heart of the city.

Street Network

Fredericksburg’s future Thoroughfare Plan (further described in Chapter 6: Transportation Master Plan Development) delineates three primary east-west civic streets in the historic downtown area:

- Main Street
- Austin Street
- San Antonio Street

Main Street serves the dual functions of facilitating efficient throughput and providing access to downtown parking and local businesses. Austin Street and San Antonio Street run parallel to Main Street, one block away to the north and the south. They serve as circulation travel-ways in the historic district and provide additional on-street parking for residents and visitors. The following north-south civic streets are also part of the downtown circulating system: Milam Street, Adams Street, Llano Street, and Washington Street.

Existing Issues

Attractions including the Admiral Nimitz Museum, local wineries and bed and breakfasts, scenic cycling routes, and shops and restaurants representing the city’s German heritage draw a steady stream of visitors to the hill country. As both a tourism destination and a designated highway, Main Street faces the competing objectives of mobility and local multimodal access. Residents traveling to their daily destinations find themselves in conflict with visitors looking to park and enjoy the city’s renowned dining, shopping and historical attractions.

Main Street development and improvements must continue to be guided such that it is a comfortable and appealing destination for locals and visitors, yet also an efficient thoroughfare for everyday travel. The existing cross-section on Main Street has limited sidewalk widths, long blocks, and signalized pedestrian crossings at intersections that quickly become congested during heavy tourist times.
Travelway Analysis

The existing cross-section along Main Street includes four travel lanes, a center lane with left turn bays, and angled on-street parking.

While the dimensions of the outside travel lane and angled on-street parking spaces do not meet minimum Urban Land Institute recommendations for urban thoroughfares, vehicles can park in the angled spaces with less delay to through traffic than would accompany parallel parking. The existing angled parking along Main Street is adjacent to an outside lane that is narrower than would generally be recommended for 45-degree parking, resulting in slower speeds and an underutilized traffic lane.

Minimum Dimensions for Head-In Angled On-Street Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>Stall Width (Perpendicular to Curb)</th>
<th>Stall Depth</th>
<th>Min. Width of Adjacent Lane</th>
<th>Curb Overhang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45°</td>
<td>8.5–9.0 feet</td>
<td>17 feet 8 inches</td>
<td>12 feet 8 inches</td>
<td>1 foot 9 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50°</td>
<td>8.5–9.0 feet</td>
<td>18 feet 3 inches</td>
<td>13 feet 3 inches</td>
<td>1 foot 11 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55°</td>
<td>8.5–9.0 feet</td>
<td>18 feet 8 inches</td>
<td>13 feet 8 inches</td>
<td>2 feet 1 inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60°</td>
<td>8.5–9.0 feet</td>
<td>19 feet 0 inches</td>
<td>14 feet 6 inches</td>
<td>2 feet 2 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65°</td>
<td>8.5–9.0 feet</td>
<td>19 feet 2 inches</td>
<td>15 feet 5 inches</td>
<td>2 feet 3 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70°</td>
<td>8.5–9.0 feet</td>
<td>19 feet 3 inches</td>
<td>16 feet 6 inches</td>
<td>2 feet 4 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90°</td>
<td>8.5–9.0 feet</td>
<td>18 feet 0 inches</td>
<td>24 feet 0 inches</td>
<td>2 feet 6 inches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:
- Typical design vehicle dimensions: 6 feet 7 inches by 17 feet 0 inches. Use 9.0 feet wide stall in commercial areas with moderate to high parking turnover.
- *For back-in angled parking, reduce curb overhang by one foot.

Sidewalk Width

Vibrant streets create an appealing sense of place by combining travel modes using wide sidewalks, accessible parking, and bicycle parking. Ample sidewalk widths also expand opportunities for

human-scaled building edges; storefronts and street dining areas that blur the line between public and private spaces are far more inviting than blank walls or vast parking lots.\textsuperscript{10}

Over 1 million visitors flock to Fredericksburg each year, creating the potential for pedestrian congestion on Main Street during peak periods. A crowded perception can harm the tourism industry, so careful planning is required to maintain the peaceful downtown atmosphere for which Fredericksburg is known.

Along many segments of Main Street, pedestrians are shielded from moving traffic by angled on-street parking and from the sun by shopfront porches or street trees. Existing sidewalk widths along Main Street vary from 4 feet wide with a grass berm to 14 feet wide.

**Signal Timing**

Because Main Street is one of the city's major arterials and serves as the gateway to the city for most visitors, Main Street traffic operations have a significant impact on residents and visitors alike. Driveways on approaches to the historic area, heavy pedestrian crossings, and parking maneuvers in the historic area create a sense of friction, resulting in traffic having to travel at lower speeds. The signals on Main Street are currently operated by TxDOT's Austin District. TxDOT recently added communications to signals from the Fredericksburg Maintenance Facility on East Main Street.

As discussed in Chapter 5: Regional Impacts and Concerns, the future construction of a relief route could transfer operations of Main Street signals to the City. This would require additional budget for equipment, staffing and training to provide signal technicians for operation and maintenance. It will also require that a communications link be established between the signals and a central system to maintain timings.

**Recommendations**

Developing recommendations for Main Street necessitates ample consideration of trade-offs, as many transportation and livability needs are competing for the same limited available right-of-way.

**Pedestrians**

Creating comfortable spaces for people along urban streets is about more than providing alternate travel modes to driving; it is about implementing strategies that encourage community and connections between people. In destinations like Fredericksburg, downtown streets have the potential to return to being “places,” not just “conduits for cars.”\textsuperscript{10}

While Fredericksburg's historic district already extends warm Texas hospitality to visitors, widening the narrow sidewalk segments would provide more space for benches, street trees, and bicycle racks. Maintaining beautiful public spaces for friends and family to gather during downtown excursions is central to the city’s character and charm. In addition, providing increasingly convenient access to parking spaces where possible contributes to high parking turnover and consequently increased revenue for local businesses. Right-of-way is limited in some places by historic properties or other physical constraints, but maximizing the coverage of wide sidewalks would strengthen the city’s pedestrian

\textsuperscript{10} Streets as Places: How Transportation Can Create a Sense of Community, Project for Public Spaces, March 2014
network. For all improvements along Main Street, it is important to maintain the corridor’s unique character.

The City budgets annually for sidewalk repairs along Main Street. Roadway widening projects are another potential source of funding for sidewalk improvements.

The City has established an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition plan. Through the development of this plan, the City will evaluate current facilities, programs, policies, and practices to determine what changes are necessary to meet the ADA’s requirements, especially regarding curb ramps that allow people with disabilities to travel safely throughout Fredericksburg. According to the ADA transition plan, the City has taken the following steps towards improving accessibility:

- Designation of an ADA Coordinator
- Implementation of an ADA grievance procedure
- Conducting an ongoing self-assessment to identify issues needing to be resolved
- Complying with Federal and State requirements as facilities are modified or constructed
- Planning future improvements through the capital improvement program

Alternate Cross-Sections
Civic Streets

Built to a wide cross-section ranging from 55 to 80 feet, Austin Street and San Antonio Street function as two-lane undivided streets, with no pavement markings other than for on-street parking. The additional pavement width provides an opportunity to designate on-road bicycle facilities and install sidewalks where they are missing. Austin Street is also home to Marktplatz, which serves as the beginning and end point for most local bicycle routes.

With the wide pavement section along the civic streets, several options are available for providing increased parking, increased sidewalk width, and bicycle accommodations, as shown below:

---

The ADA and City Governments: Common Problems, U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Disability Rights Section, 2008
Main Street
Main Street is currently a four-lane cross-section with four travel lanes, a center painted island, and angled parking. At intersections, lanes are reconfigured to provide short left turn storage bays. As noted, the outside lanes need to be wider to accommodate the parking maneuvers. A short-term improvement to Main Street would be to restripe, eliminating the striped center island and increasing the outside lane widths by three feet on either side. Other, long-term considerations would be to implement a narrow, raised center island for access management as well as increasing the outside lane widths. A third option might be to consider a “road diet” whereby the road is reduced to a three-lane section, with a center turn lane, and wide outside lanes. This option would allow the widening of sidewalks and / or the incorporation of bike lanes. This option will only be viable when the truck relief route is constructed and Main Street traffic volumes become more manageable. As noted previously, maintaining the unique character of this corridor is a primary concern.
Alternate Signal Operations

This section provides an overview of relevant signal timing strategies for the Main Street corridor, identifies the project team’s analysis methods and specific recommendations, and describes anticipated benefits to traffic operations.

Coordinated Signal Timing

TxDOT is currently developing coordinated signal timing plans for Main Street. These plans, once implemented, should provide a “green band” that repeats every cycle for through vehicles and improves traffic flow. Since traffic volumes vary by time of day, it is recommended that peak, off-peak, and weekend timing plans be developed.

Providing smooth, continuous platoon progression by optimizing the timing of coordinated signal systems is regarded as one of the most cost-effective traffic management actions to reduce stops, delays, fuel consumption and exhaust emissions. Some of the advantages of traffic signal system coordination are as follows:

- Higher speed of progression and fewer stops alleviate spill-over queues.
- Smoother traffic operation increases capacity, decreases energy consumption, and reduces air pollution.
- By reducing stops at red lights, signal coordination encourages drivers to maintain a uniform speed, thereby reducing overall speed variations.
- A greater proportion of traffic will tend to remain on the arterial street system instead of using parallel minor streets, which would benefit businesses along Main Street and residents who live on minor streets.

In a progressive system, the green displays are staggered in relation to each other according to the desired road speed. A common cycle length is used for all intersections in the coordinated system, which works effectively with unequal block length and unequal splits.

The complexity of this system arises from allocating the splits for the best coordination. For unevenly spaced intersections, a compromise has to be made between the two directions. This system can be used to favor one direction over the other, e.g. inbound flow in the morning peak at the expense of the fewer vehicles traveling in the opposite direction, and vice versa in the evening peak. Adequate two-way progressions can be implemented for certain combinations of cycle length, block spacing and platoon (progressive) speed.

Analysis Methodology

The project team modeled peak hour Main Street corridor operations based on traffic data collected during the 4th of July weekend. The model uses the Synchro macroscopic traffic modelling software to measure congestion, delays, and speeds under different signal timing schemes. Synchro models were developed using current timing plans and existing intersection geometries. These models demonstrated that coordinated signal timing with an optimized cycle length would allow the entire corridor to operate at an acceptable level of service. No geometric improvements were needed.
Coordinated signal timing along Fredericksburg’s Main Street yields the following operational benefits, based on the Synchro models developed as a part of this plan:

- Reduced delays
- Reduced travel times
- Reduced fuel consumption
- Improved flow

The project team met with TxDOT to review these coordinated timing plans as a part of this plan. The Synchro models have been provided to TxDOT for their use.

**Lead/Lag & Flashing Yellow Arrow Operations**

Coordinated signal systems often use lead/lag phasing to prioritize through movement progression in a coordinated signal system. Lead/lag phasing refers to a phase sequence where one left turn begins with the adjacent through movement and the opposing left turn begins at the end of the conflicting through movement.¹²

Lead/lag operation should not be used unless the leading left turn is protected-only or has a Flashing Yellow Arrow (FYA) display. Otherwise, motorists turning left during the permissive period could encounter a phenomenon called the left-turn “amber trap.” This occurs when a motorist turning left during the permissive green period sees all the thru-movement signals on their approach turn yellow and thinks that the opposing thru-traffic is also stopping. However, in reality, the opposing thru-traffic still has the green ball that is running concurrently with the lagging left phase. This set of circumstances could trick the motorist into turning left into an oncoming vehicle. For this reason, lead/lag phasing cannot safely be used if the lead left-turn phase has a permissive interval unless a FYA is used to provide a permissive indication to the driver.

With the current five-section signal heads on Main Street, only leading left turn intervals can be utilized. With the installation of FYA displays, left turns could either come before (leading) the green ball or come after (lagging). This improvement could greatly affect the amount of “green band” progression along the arterial, reducing overall travel times.

**Split Phased Signals**

Consideration should be given to eliminating “split phased” signals. For instance, at the intersection of Highway Street and Main Street, the absence of left turn storage bays requires the intersection legs on Main Street operate separately. This type of signal phasing is very inefficient when compared to standard operations. This may require widening or restriping to install turn bays at these intersections.

---

¹² *Traffic Signal Timing Manual, Federal Highway Administration, June 2008*
Pedestrian Signal Operations

The time allotted to the “walk” phase for pedestrians at a signalized intersection crosswalk is generally governed by the coincident vehicular through phase. Several safety issues can result from traditional pedestrian treatments at signals:

- Right-turning drivers, facing distractions like local attractions, following directions, or looking for parking can forget to yield to pedestrians entering the crosswalk.

- When pedestrians face significant delays at designated crosswalks, they often choose to cross mid-block or in conflict with traffic signals, creating safety issues.

To increase pedestrian safety and comfort, TxDOT has recently implemented a Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) at some intersections along Main Street that gives pedestrians the “WALK” signal with a three- to six-second head-start before the parallel vehicular movement is given the green light.

Other pedestrian signal timing strategies are as follows:

- A “scramble phase” is sometimes employed in areas with high pedestrian traffic. Also known as an exclusive pedestrian phase, the scramble phase allows pedestrian movements in all directions, even diagonally between intersection corners, while all vehicles are stopped.

- The “split pedestrian phase” divides the time allotted to the pedestrian phase and the parallel vehicular through movement into two parts: a vehicular right turn with a “DON’T WALK” pedestrian signal, and a through-only vehicular movement while pedestrians cross. The split pedestrian phase removes the conflict between right-turning vehicles and pedestrians using the crosswalk. This strategy would be most effective at intersections with the heaviest pedestrian utilization, such as the intersection of Washington Street and Main Street, adjacent to the Admiral Nimitz Museum.

---
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CHAPTER 5: REGIONAL IMPACTS AND CONCERNS

Fredericksburg’s transportation network comprises local elements, as described in the previous chapter, but also regional systems and influences.

**Truck Relief Route**

The volume of heavy vehicles using Main Street is perceived as problematic for quality of life in the historic area. The resulting noise along a major destination corridor and potential safety issues from large vehicles (many carrying wind turbines) coming through downtown can create frustration for pedestrians and business owners.

The Hazardous Materials Commodity Flow Study completed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute in 2012 made the following observations of daily weekday truck traffic volumes in Fredericksburg:

- 510 trucks traversed Main Street (250 eastbound and 260 westbound) between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.
- There were 23 trucks per hour on US 290, east of Washington Street.
- 4.3% of trucks observed had HazMat placards.
- Nearly 63% of trucks observed on Main Street were tractor-trailer configurations.

According to the City’s Comprehensive Plan:

“Reducing truck traffic in [Fredericksburg’s central roadway segments] will strengthen the community character and economic appeal of the CBD. It may benefit the trucks as well, if they can use routes through Fredericksburg that are less congested and have fewer traffic lights.”
A truck relief route for the City of Fredericksburg has been planned for fifty years in the following plans and studies:

- 1967 Comprehensive Plan
- 1973 Gillespie County Transportation Plan
- 1996 City Thoroughfare Plan
- 2003 TxDOT Alignment Study
- 2006 Comprehensive Plan
- 2006 Thoroughfare Plan
- 2013 Alternate Truck Route Analysis
- 2015 Relief Route Preliminary Report

A proposed solution is to remove the truck route designation from Main Street and instead construct a truck relief route around the city, shown on the Thoroughfare Plan as “Southwest Hill Country Drive.” With the new relief route, the truck route designation could be removed from Main Street, and TxDOT could be consulted regarding the possibility of truck limitations in the downtown area.\(^\text{14}\)

Beginning in 2013, an 11-member Relief Route Task Force discussed design alternatives with TxDOT representatives and in 2015 proposed a 140-foot rural cross-section to meet current transportation needs and accommodate future expansion.\(^\text{15}\)

![City-Recommended Cross-Section](image)

An alignment for the relief route has not yet been selected, although primary and alternate routes are differentiated in the updated Thoroughfare Plan (previously known as Loop 9 and Loop 6, respectively).

\(^{14}\) 2006 Comprehensive Plan, City of Fredericksburg  
\(^{15}\) Gillespie County Relief Route Preliminary Report, November 2015
Close coordination with Gillespie County and TxDOT Austin District will accelerate the relief route design and construction process. Some of this coordination will take place as a part of the City's corridor and feasibility study that is under development. Study costs are shared between the City, the County, and TxDOT.

While not a focus of this plan, land use planning will also be an important element to ensure local compatibility of the proposed alignment, bolster its ability to serve the needs of through traffic, and minimize impacts to adjacent and nearby landowners.

The following next steps are recommended for the City:

- Finalize the relief route alignment
- Acquire and preserve right-of-way
  - A bond will likely be required for appraisal and acquisition
- Determine funding sources and phasing strategies
  - Include local match funds and ROW acquisition in the CIP
  - Consider a bond election
- Coordinate with TxDOT
  - Roadway design
  - Construction
  - Operations and maintenance

Main Street Operations & Maintenance
Once the relief route is constructed TxDOT will require the City to take over operations of Main Street between the termini of the route. The City should budget for additional annual maintenance costs once this occurs, including an allocation for operation and maintenance of the traffic signals.

Transit Services
Public transportation has far-reaching community benefits. Transit use can:

- Decrease traffic congestion, and therefore travel times
- Increase mobility for people who are unable to drive
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from personal vehicles
- Foster a sense of community among transit ridership
- Reduce the demand for limited available parking
- Create local jobs for drivers and fleet managers
- Increase access of disadvantaged populations to schools and workplaces

There is a wide spectrum of transit options, from the commuter rail and bus rapid transit in an urban context, to the paratransit shuttles that meet the needs of a more rural area. The appropriate transit options for a given community depend on population and employment density.
Existing Transit Services

Existing transit in the Fredericksburg area is provided by Alamo Regional Transit (ART). Gillespie County is the northernmost county in ART’s service area. ART provides on-demand services with small buses and vans, giving priority to senior citizens, low-income families, persons with disabilities, and veterans. The most common uses for this service are non-emergency medical, work, school, daycare, and other personal needs.\textsuperscript{16}

A privately owned and operated trolley service currently provides local historical narrated tours for the public, chartered tours for private groups, and shuttle service from area hotels to downtown Fredericksburg.\textsuperscript{17} Other buses and taxis also provide transportation to and from major destinations like San Antonio.\textsuperscript{18}

Transit Recommendations

As part of the ongoing parking study, a feasibility study is underway to evaluate the option of running a private shuttle route from hotels to the downtown area. The results of this study will be available on the City’s website.

If local population and employment thresholds do not create a sustainable environment for the establishment of a traditional urban transit service, the expansion of the existing trolley service and partnerships with private transportation network companies (TNCs) could help to fill the gap.

Other ideas for transit initiatives include:

\begin{itemize}
  \item **Kerrville Shuttle:** The Alamo Area Council of Governments conducted a study in 2014 to investigate the feasibility of a weekday Kerrville-Fredericksburg shuttle service. The study proposed one shuttle that would make four one-way trips between the two cities between 6 a.m. and 8:15 a.m. and three one-way trips between 5:15 p.m. and 7:45 p.m.\textsuperscript{19}
  \item **Center City Shuttle:** A circulator bus route through downtown Fredericksburg would allow people to board and alight at various local destinations. The circulator route, which would use small buses or rubber-tired trolleys, would reduce the need for visitors to walk long distances or search repeatedly for parking spaces. This service could also alleviate Main Street traffic, especially during special events.\textsuperscript{18}
  \item **On-demand Transit Service:** A local transit service to assist County residents with transportation could supplement the services that ART provides.
  \item **Airport Shuttle Service:** A regularly scheduled shuttle service from Gillespie County Airport to the San Antonio International Airport and Austin-Bergstrom International Airport would enhance mobility options for residents, while also making it easier for out-of-state visitors to travel to Fredericksburg. A feasibility study is recommended to evaluate the benefits and costs of an inter-airport shuttle service.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{16} Alamo Regional Transit Informational Brochure, Alamo Area Council of Governments
\textsuperscript{17} https://www.fbgtours.com/
\textsuperscript{18} 2006 Comprehensive Plan, City of Fredericksburg
\textsuperscript{19} Kerrville/Fredericksburg Shuttle Presentation, Alamo Regional Transit, Alamo Area Council of Governments, November 2014
Connectivity to Major Population Centers

Fredericksburg is 70 miles from San Antonio and 80 miles from Austin. Access to these centers is a priority for the City of Fredericksburg. SH 16 (Adams Street) and US 290 (Main Street) are the primary routes. As such, improvements along these corridors should be given a high priority when looking at capital improvement projects. The City will continue working with TxDOT to develop funding for projects along these routes.

Enchanted Rock Traffic

Located 18 miles north of Fredericksburg in Llano County, the Enchanted Rock State Natural Area is a well-known destination for hiking, camping, and climbing. The park frequently reaches its maximum capacity early in the day on weekends and holidays, with significant queueing on Ranch Road 965 towards Llano to the north and Fredericksburg to the south.

Flashing signs on Ranch Road 965 alert drivers approaching from both directions when the park is full. Visitors who arrive soon after the park reaches capacity sometimes receive parking vouchers to return in the afternoon. These visitors are likely to spend time in Fredericksburg in the meantime. The installation of additional flashing signs for drivers leaving Fredericksburg could alert them sooner that the park is full, saving travel time.
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CHAPTER 6: TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN DEVELOPMENT

This chapter explains the process that was undertaken to develop the TMP and update the existing Thoroughfare Plan. This TMP ties together existing plans and provides a cohesive vision for the City’s transportation network, with a focus on key local and regional concerns.

Thoroughfare Plan

A Thoroughfare Plan is the tool that enables the City to preserve future roadway corridors and to protect or acquire the necessary right-of-way to improve the local transportation system. The plan consists of a map that reflects the City’s goals regarding future thoroughfare alignments, thoroughfare design standards, and cross-sections within city limits and the one-mile Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).

The Thoroughfare Plan incorporates feasibility constraints including floodplains, steep contours, creeks, and historic areas. Analysis of land use context zones also allows the City to develop context-sensitive alternative street designs, where appropriate.

Update

The most recent Thoroughfare Plan was developed in 2006. As a part of the effort to develop this Transportation Master Plan, the Thoroughfare Plan was reviewed and brought up to date for 2017. This updated map can be found in the Appendix.

Main updates to the Thoroughfare Plan include:

- Addition of new CIP projects
- Addition of existing segments of Friendship Lane, Sunrise Street, Brehmer Lane, Post Oak Road, and Windcrest Street
- Removal of Friendship Lane as an alternate truck relief route (due to its design speed of 45 mph and lack of support from TxDOT)
Alignment with Comprehensive Plan

This 2017 Transportation Master Plan builds upon previous planning efforts, particularly the 2006 Comprehensive Plan and 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, to serve the community both in terms of a comprehensive vision and in its day-to-day use.

One of the key thoroughfare components of the Comprehensive Plan was the planned Outer Loop or truck relief route, which is described in Chapter 5: Regional Impacts and Concerns.

Thoroughfare Design Standards

The City of Fredericksburg has minimum design standards in their Subdivision Regulations. Design standards for entry corridors were established in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update along major corridors, near major destinations and for buildings adjacent to the Historic District. These standards provide guidance for new development in order to create character in the corridors.

Road Classifications

Fredericksburg’s Thoroughfare Plan is comprised of a variety of standard street types, with the overall system designed to maintain balance between mobility (the through movement of trips) and access to destinations. Fredericksburg’s functional classification system is structured in a hierarchical manner, with the goal of providing a balanced network with appropriate roadway capacity, access, and efficiency. The network is made up of three classifications of streets: Major Arterial, Collectors, and Local Roads. Civic streets are also designated on the Thoroughfare Plan. A summary of the functional class characteristics is shown in the figure below.
Physical Constraints & Planning Considerations

There is not a single solution for improving all streets and enhancing mobility throughout the city. Street design that is context-sensitive, by definition, will vary in its cross-section based on the existing physical constraints, the character of the land use in the surrounding area, and the preferences of the community.

Corridor Cross-sections

The City’s Code of Ordinances Chapter 38 Section 6.12. contains Subdivision Design Standards for Streets (updated in 2014). It includes the following street types:

- Divided Highway
- Civic Street
- Arterial
- Collector
- Type A Local Street – A1
- Type A Local Street – A2
- Type B Local Street
- Type ETJ Local Street
- Marginal Access Local Street
- Type RR Local Street

Most Fredericksburg streets have been planned and constructed based on one preferred design for each functional classification. While a standard street design, known as a typical cross-section, may be appropriate in many cases, in some areas, an alternative design may be more appropriate. There is not a single solution for improving all streets and enhancing mobility throughout the city. Street design that is context-sensitive, by definition, will vary in its cross-section based on the existing physical constraints, the character of the land use in the surrounding area, and the preferences of the community.

The following cross-sections illustrate the standard design for streets designated as collector or higher, as defined by the City’s Subdivision Regulations. Each section represents the predominant section of roadway and identifies the preferred street elements and widths. Street element measurements are from face of curb.
Multimodal Streets
Multimodal elements are an important part of the Thoroughfare Plan design standards. Establishing thoroughfare design standards with active transportation modes in mind supports community health and vibrancy and relieves the street network of automobile trips.

Pedestrian & Bicycle Circulation
Goals of the recommended pedestrian facility design concepts are to:

- Improve pedestrian safety and mobility,
- Support access to downtown businesses, and
- Create streetscape elements that complement the city’s historic identity, while also not impeding vehicular travel.

“Fredericksburg is fortunate to have a downtown area that is very walkable. It retains the historic character and street grid of a downtown developed when most trips were made on foot. This is an important asset in planning for the mobility needs of future residents and businesses.”

The City has the following objectives for walkability and bikeability in Fredericksburg:

- Follow context-sensitive design principles for new pedestrian facilities by creating trails or sidewalks that correspond to their surroundings, whether natural, suburban, or urban.
- Prioritize the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists along multimodal connections in rural areas, where vehicles travel at high speeds.

---

20 2006 Comprehensive Plan, City of Fredericksburg
• Design the four land use focus areas from the Comprehensive Plan to be highly walkable and connected to other existing sidewalks and trails.
  − Airport Focus Area
    • Area surrounding Gillespie County Airport, including Lady Bird Johnson Park
  − Health Focus Area
    • Area surrounding Hill Country Memorial Hospital and other medical facilities
  − University Focus Area
    • Region along US 290 west of downtown near Fort Martin Scott and the Texas Hill Country University Center
  − Residential Focus Area
    • Relatively flat region of ETJ northeast of downtown between State Highway 16 and Ranch Road 1631 with development opportunities

• Continue to design the downtown sidewalk network with pedestrian safety and comfort in mind.
  − Shaded areas, wayfinding signage, and sidewalks located adjacent to interesting locations improve the pedestrian experience. Attractive waste receptacles also promote cleanliness along pedestrian walkways.
  − On-street parking stalls and landscaping provide a buffer between travel lanes and sidewalks.
  − Corner bulb outs (or curb extensions) along Main Street create safer and shorter crossings for pedestrians. They can also create additional space for seating and street furniture.
  − Downtown pedestrian crossings can be further enhanced with unique pavers or stamped asphalt.
Bike Routes & Trails
Signed bike routes and multiuse trails provide opportunities for healthy recreation, exercise, and community building. As noted in Chapter 3: Existing Conditions, existing bicycle routes have been documented and vetted with the local bicycle community, while not specifically endorsed by the City for safety.

Trails are used for walking and bicycling and typically are located in greenways. The design and construction of additional trails in Fredericksburg will require careful planning and right-of-way preservation. Recommendations for proposed are integrated into this TMP through the updated Thoroughfare Plan. Funding sources for additional trails could include applying for support from partner agencies, such as Texas Parks and Wildlife Grants. Trails on new development could be a requirement of the developer. Citizen support for trails was evident at the public open house, with approximately one third of the attendees indicating that they would prefer trails over other projects. Some short segments of the trail plan were opposed. These sections have been re-routed along city roadways in the updated Thoroughfare Plan.

Sidewalks
Throughout much of the city, the primary facilities for non-motorized travel and active transportation are sidewalks. In newer areas, most sidewalks are constructed at the time development occurs, and the City is responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of adjacent sidewalks through the Annual Sidewalk Improvements Project. However, older neighborhoods are typically in greater need of sidewalk repairs or lack sidewalks altogether.

The 2015 Sidewalk Plan identifies critical gaps in the existing pedestrian network and locations around the city where sidewalks need improvements. The City has also begun integrating trail and bicycle facilities to connect key areas around the city.
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CHAPTER 7: IMPLEMENTATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter outlines recommended prioritization of transportation improvement needs to provide the City with the ability to best determine effective timing for mobility investments. It also discusses additional steps for successful implementation of the TMP.

Prioritization of Transportation Needs: CIP Ranking Tool

The City of Fredericksburg has a limited annual budget for Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects. To prioritize CIP funds in alignment with their established transportation planning goals, the City created a CIP ranking tool as a part of the TMP development process. The CIP ranking tool is an Excel spreadsheet that aids in ranking transportation projects based on data-driven performance measures that map back to the City's planning goals.

As described in Chapter 2: Transportation Planning Framework, the goals that govern this TMP resulted from an eight-hour staff workshop on January 20, 2017 and a subsequent City Council workshop held on March 6, 2017. The weights assigned to each goal in the CIP ranking tool are derived from activities in which City staff distributed a sample budget of $100 between the goals. Of the nine goals, the three that received the lowest weights were removed to simplify the project ranking process. The weights from these goals were distributed among the remaining six goals. The tool was developed and refined based on feedback from the City. Subsequent council workshops were held on March 6, 2017 and June 19, 2017 to review updates to the CIP tool. Then it was used to rank existing and proposed projects.

The CIP ranking tool includes all projects in the current CIP plan. Additional projects were added to reflect improvements needed to implement the Thoroughfare Plan. Each project loaded into the CIP ranking tool receives an aggregate score based on how it performs against quantifiable performance measures assigned to each goal. The following sections provide descriptions of the goals and performance measures employed by the CIP ranking tool.

Congestion Mitigation

Congestion mitigation is the top priority identified by City staff and councilmembers. Projects that are expected to improve traffic flow by adding turn lanes at intersections or improving signal operations receive points in the ranking tool. Projects that take place along major roads with higher traffic volumes and are expected to reduce CO₂ emissions are also given priority.

Safety & Welfare

While safety benefits of a project are often difficult to quantify, especially prior to implementation, the CIP ranking tool uses historical crash data and legal claims to identify where safety concerns exist and may be mitigated by the project. If crashes have been recorded within the project limits or there are known legal claims that may be affected by the project, the project receives points.

Projects that provide enhanced connections between residential areas and local businesses, or between two economic centers, are considered resident welfare improvements.
Connectivity
Connectivity is a key element of the City’s transportation planning framework. Safer and more robust connections for all modes of transportation improves quality of life, reduces travel times, and supports local business who enjoy improved customer access and visibility. The performance measures in the ranking tool for this goal center on linking critical destinations, including historic, civic, and natural sites, with a focus on connections to schools. Priority is also given to increased connectivity to existing parking facilities, both on-street and off-street.

Often a transportation network is compromised by gaps in the system of roadways, sidewalks, bicycle facilities, or trails. Projects that fill identified gaps in Fredericksburg’s transportation network receive points for connectivity, with increased weight allotted to projects that fill gaps in networks for multiple modes.

Mobility
The goal of mobility gives points to projects that improve travel efficiency. The proposed truck relief route, for example, would receive a high mobility score because it promotes smooth traffic flow for trucks traveling through Fredericksburg, as well as for local traffic on Main Street. Other mobility performance measures prioritize projects that add through lanes to roadways or promote non-automobile mobility.

Implementation
Often a project that meets multiple transportation goals is stalled by right-of-way constraints or funding challenges. To promote timely completion of CIP projects, projects that have identified funding sources or supportive agency partners receive points in the ranking tool. Projects that do not require acquisition of additional right-of-way are also weighted by this category.

Community Character
Fredericksburg is famous for its serenity and hospitality, and it is important to the City to maintain this character. To this end, the CIP ranking tool gives points to improvement projects that are located in the historic district or enhance pedestrian facilities and signage. The addition of aesthetic elements like landscaping or stylized gateway improvements, or active transportation amenities, including benches, shade canopies, and bike parking, also raises a project’s community character score.

One-Way Street Conversion
One step of the TMP process was field observations for the improvement of vehicular mobility, including providing recommendations about converting two-way streets in the historic district to one-way. Several streets were evaluated by studying the potential benefits and disadvantages associated with one-way conversion.
Potential Benefits

- Increased traffic capacity
  - Under appropriate circumstances, a pair of one-way streets can have a greater capacity than a pair of two-way streets. Signal timing plans for one-way street networks can allow for more efficient allocation of green time.

- Reduced number of conflict points for drivers
  - There are fewer turning movements at an intersection of one-way streets that with two-way streets, which decreases the potential for collisions of through vehicles with turning vehicles.
  - At signalized intersections, the reduction in vehicle movements can result in more green time for the remaining movements, decreasing the amount of driver delay.

- Reduced delay caused by curbside activity
  - Loading and unloading is often less disruptive on a one-way street, where other through lanes allow drivers to bypass service vehicles.

- Increased on-street parking capacity
  - An estimated 30% more spaces can be gained when parallel parking on a two-way street is converted to angled parking on a one-way street.

- Bike lanes
  - Converting a street to one-way operations allows consideration of installing six-foot-wide bicycle lanes without removing any vehicle lanes.

Costs and Disadvantages

- Economics
  - Businesses often believe two-way streets provide greater access and increase their visibility to traffic.

- Cost of signal modification
  - Traffic signals would need to be modified or removed to accommodate one-way travel at each signalized intersection.

- Costs of pavement markings and signage
  - Appropriate markings and signage would be needed to accommodate one-way travel.

- Navigation confusion
  - One-way street networks can be more confusing for drivers. A circulation system of two-way streets may be easier for drivers to understand, particularly visitors unfamiliar with downtown.

- Potential increase in traffic speeds
  - One-way streets tend to increase traffic speeds, which can create a less comfortable environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.

- Conflict points for pedestrians
  - The unusual configuration can reduce pedestrians’ ability to predict vehicle behavior.
• Increased Circulation Volumes
  – Networks of one-way streets cause drivers to add distance to their trips when they are required to travel in the opposite direction of intended travel, increasing overall vehicle miles traveled and travel times for individual drivers. The necessity of these maneuvers also potentially increases areawide traffic congestion.\(^{21}\)

Recommendations
1. North Washington Street from Main Street to Austin – This segment of Washington Street is underutilized, serving as a two-lane undivided roadway with parallel parking on both sides. Converting to one-way operations northbound would improve intersection efficiency at the intersection of Main Street and Washington. It would also allow for consideration of installing angled parking or bike lanes.

2. East Creek Street from Adams to Llano – Vehicle lanes are typically 11 to 12 feet wide in each direction. A parked vehicle utilizes approximately seven feet of pavement width. This street is only 26 feet wide, which can cause problems for two way operations if vehicles are parked along the curb. It is recommended that this street be converted to one way operation eastbound, which will allow vehicular access in the case that cars are parked on both sides of the street. It will also enhance efficiency of the intersection at South Adams Street, as fewer vehicle movements will have to be served at the traffic signal.

3. North Adams Street from Travis to College – Similar to East Creek Street, this narrow street is only 23 feet wide. Furthermore, it serves as a circulation route for Fredericksburg Middle School traffic. It is recommended that this street be designated as a one-way street southbound for this segment.

4. West Schubert Street from North Adams to North Crockett – This street serves the Town Pool and Turner Hall. The eastern segment of this block is narrow and creates problems when vehicles are parked on both sides of the street. Converting the street to one-way operations westbound will allow additional parking to be added and still have unrestricted passage of vehicles.

Based on existing traffic volumes, the large proportion of visitor traffic, and the City’s focus on local businesses and safety for multimodal travel, it is not recommended for the other downtown two-way streets to be converted to one-way at this time.

\(^{21}\) Advantages and Disadvantages of One-Way Streets, Glatting Jackson Kercher Anglin, PlanPhilly, October 2007
The recommended improvements in the Transportation Master Plan will vary in cost depending on the necessary funds for project design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction. This chapter describes funding sources that are currently utilized and additional sources that could be considered.

**Current Process**

The City uses the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to allocate funding for transportation improvements. The CIP budget is currently funded through the general fund. The Street portion of the CIP represents a substantial portion of the total CIP budget. Sidewalks and trails are maintained and constructed using Parks and Recreation Department funds.

CIP projects include new street sections, street reconstruction, sidewalk installation, and intersection realignments in various locations throughout the city based on need and the existing Thoroughfare Plan.\(^{22}\)

**Alternative Funding Sources**

While the City will undoubtedly provide a significant share of the costs, combining funds from multiple sources can help ease the burden on taxpayers. The following sections outline some of the potential funding sources for the recommended transportation action items.

**City Revenue Streams**

**Property Tax**

Property taxes are commonly used to fund the costs of transportation projects, along with their operation and maintenance. Property in the City of Fredericksburg is assessed each year by the Gillespie County Appraisal District. The 2016 city tax rate for Fredericksburg is $0.24 per $100 in valuation.

**Local Sales Tax**

Local sales taxes are widely used for funding transportation projects. In addition to being fairly consistent and predictable, they are also inflation sensitive. A major drawback to using sales tax is that it is not possible to link the use of roadways to payment of the tax.

**Vehicle Registration Fees**

Municipal governments are allowed to impose vehicle registration fees for the funding of transportation programs within their jurisdictions. These fees generate stable revenue and require minimal administrative expense. They are generally considered a user-based tax.

---

\(^{22}\) City of Fredericksburg Capital Improvement Projects Plan
Bonds
A municipality has the authority to issue bonds to finance the construction of public improvements. Bonds can be an efficient and effective means of financing large public projects. If the issuance of the bonds is subject to voter approval, advance planning will be required.

A candidate bond program could be funding the local match for construction and right-of-way acquisition for the truck relief route.

- General Obligation (GO) / Local Obligation (LO)
- Backed by Property Tax / Portion of Traffic Violation Fines

Economic Development Corporations / Dedicated Sales Tax
Fredericksburg is eligible to adopt section 4A and 4B sales taxes for economic development. The funds raised by 4A taxes must be spend on projects that create or retain primary jobs. If a road project is needed to promote or develop new or expanded business enterprises, then 4A funds can be used.

Section 4B taxes do not have to be tied to jobs to be used for roadway projects. These taxes can be up to half of one percent for each. However, there is a two percent limit to the total amount of all local sales and use taxes collected by a city.

Permits and Fees
There are a number of ways that development permits and fees can be used to provide funds for ongoing and future road improvement and maintenance.

Transportation Utility Fee
The City of Austin has established a fee that treats the road network as a utility. This fee assists with street maintenance, repairs, traffic signals, construction, and operations. Users are billed each month on their waste collection bill.

Stormwater Utility (SWU) Fees
Since streets form a part of the drainage system, certain maintenance activities may be eligible for funding through the SWU. These include the cleaning of streets and maintaining areas where drainage is affected. They can also be used to construct new roadways or storm drains that will improve the drainage system.

Roadway Impact Fees
Impact fees are a mechanism for funding the public infrastructure necessitated by new development. Across the country, they are used to fund police and fire facilities, parks, schools, roads and utilities. In Texas, the legislature has allowed their use for water, wastewater, roadway and drainage facilities. In the most basic terms, impact fees are meant to recover the incremental cost of each new unit of development in terms of new infrastructure needs. In the case of transportation impact fees, the infrastructure need is increased capacity on arterial roadways. Often in cities with impact fee systems, only capacity improvements identified in the Capital Improvement Plan are eligible to utilize impact fee funds. Transportation impact fees are assessed when a final plat is recorded, and are collected when a
building permit is issued. Therefore, funds are not collected until development-impacts are introduced to the transportation system. Funds are collected within designated service areas and can be used only within the same service area.

**Site Specific**
As development occurs, the City requires ROW dedications by landowners and developers. The subdivision regulations also require a Traffic Impact Analysis for developments that generate a substantial amount of traffic, as discussed in the next section.

**Traffic Impact Analysis**
These analyses identify mitigation measures needed to maintain acceptable operations at nearby intersections. Most cities require developers to pay for their “pro-rata share” of these improvements. The requirement for a Traffic Impact Analysis is established in the City of Fredericksburg Subdivision Ordinance.

**Boundary Street Policies**
The City can adopt a boundary street policy which requires developers to construct one half of the cross-section for Thoroughfare Plan street adjacent to their property and the full cross-section for streets running through their development.

**Rough Proportionality**
Case law and state legislation requires that Cities verify that transportation improvements required of developers be “roughly proportionate” to the demand that the development places on the roadway network. There are several spreadsheets available from the cities of Austin, San Antonio, and Fort Worth that can be used to perform this check.

**Potential Partner Agencies**
Especially for transportation projects whose impact exceeds the boundary of Fredericksburg’s city limits, partnerships with other agencies can be feasible and advantageous.

**Gillespie County**
It is fairly common for Counties and Cities to partner on roadway projects that cross jurisdictional lines. A large number of Gillespie county residents live and work in the city’s corporate limits and Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ). By working closely with Gillespie County, roadways in the ETJ that continue on to other county destinations can be better planned.

**TxDOT**
With primary access to and through Fredericksburg being on TxDOT roadways, the City can provide local match funds to help leverage state projects. These would require Advance Funding Agreements between the City and TxDOT. In addition to roadway projects, TxDOT has the ability to build smaller projects using Hazard Elimination Program and Safe Routes to School funding.
TxDOT can also provide funding assistance through the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB). The overall goal of the SIB program is to provide innovative financing methods to communities and assist them in meeting their infrastructure needs. The SIB program allows borrowers to access capital funds at or lower-than-market interest rates. For a project to be eligible for a SIB loan, it must be on the state’s highway system and included in the statewide Transportation Improvement Plan.

Work eligible for the program’s funding in Texas includes planning and preliminary studies, feasibility, economic and environmental studies, right-of-way acquisition, surveying, appraisal and testing, utility relocation, engineering and design, construction, inspection, and construction engineering.

Regional Mobility Authorities (Tolls)
Often the amount of available state funding is inadequate to address pressing transportation needs. Constructing new roadways as turnpikes or tollways provides an additional revenue stream, which can be a catalyst for congestion relief.

Grants from Outside Agencies
Periodically, outside agencies and organizations provide opportunities for grants and other funding to help promote projects consistent with their goals. Transportation and sustainability have been the subjects of a number of grant programs in the past, but there are other objectives as well.

As with other types of outside funding, the city or organization seeking a grant is often required to provide in-kind services or some percentage of the total funding for a project that is approved. The important thing is to be creative, proactive and persistent when looking for grant funds.

Special Districts
Special improvement districts are authorized through state legislation for the funding of public improvements. These include Transportation Reinvestment Zones (TRZ), Roadway Improvement Districts (RID), Public Improvement Districts (PID), and Municipal Utility Districts (MUD). These districts allow for the sale of bonds to make infrastructure improvements and then pay off the bonds over time through special taxes or the increase in tax values in the district.

Tax Increment Financing
Tax increment financing encourages economic development within a defined geographic area or zone. It is primarily focused on infrastructure development. Enabled by Transportation Infrastructure Zones (from the Texas Transportation Code) or Tax Increment Reinvestment Zones (TIRZ, from the Texas Tax Code), tax increment financing sets aside property tax revenues due to assessed valuation growth to stimulate economic development in a zone.23

Public-Private Partnerships
Due to widespread public opposition to raising taxes to fund major infrastructure investments, alternative funding sources like public-private partnerships (PPPs) are often pursued. In these types of projects, the city, developer and other agencies (i.e. school district, utility providers, TxDOT, etc.) agree on the scope and cost of the project to construct, with each agreeing to pay a percentage of the cost.

23 Tax Increment Financing: Council Work Session Presentation, City of Austin Financial Services Department, June 2013
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Appendix A: Meetings

- Meeting Agendas
- Meeting Notes
- Workshop Materials
- Workshop Exercise Results
- Council Exercise Results
- Open House Exercise Results

Appendix B: Existing Plans

- 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update – Introduction & Purpose
- 2015 Sidewalk Plan
- 2006 Thoroughfare Plan
- 2016 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) – Street Dept Summary
- Parks, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan – Introduction
- 2016 Zoning Map
- Gillespie Country Relief Route Preliminary Report (No Appendices)

Appendix C: Additional Information

- 2017 Thoroughfare Plan Update
- Bike Route Map
Appendix A: Meetings

- Meeting Agendas
- Meeting Notes
- Workshop Materials
- Workshop Exercise Results
- Council Exercise Results
- Open House Exercise Results
State of the Existing City ................................................................. 8AM – 9:30AM
   Discuss Known Issues
   Go over Current CIP Projects
   Identify Additional Projects and Problem Areas

Discuss Ideal Transportation System .................................................. 9:30AM – 10AM
   Discuss possible solutions (without monetary restrictions)

Walk Problem Areas (Historic District) ............................................... 10AM – 12PM
   Visit problem areas and take photos / note issues

Catered Lunch (Break) .......................................................................... 12PM – 1PM

Drive to Problem Areas (Outside Historic District) ......................... 1PM – 2:30PM
   Visit problem areas and stop at locations to take photos / note issues

Discuss Goals for Transportation Plan .............................................. 2:30PM – 3PM
   Develop a concise list of goals for prioritizing projects

Develop Priorities and Weights for System Goals ............................ 3PM – 4PM
   Various exercises to help decide project prioritization

Discuss Available Funding Sources & Implementation Strategy ......... 4PM – 5PM
   Discuss existing CIP budget
   Discuss alternative funding sources (TIF, TIRZ, etc.)
Attendees
- Kent Myers, City of Fredericksburg
- Clinton Bailey, City of Fredericksburg
- Brian Jordan, City of Fredericksburg
- Garret Bonn, City of Fredericksburg
- Brian Van De Walle, Kimley-Horn
- Jake Gutekunst, Kimley-Horn

Action Items
- Garrett/Clinton to send KH:
  - Line item cost info on completed CIP projects
- KH to:
  - Send proposal to expand scope to visualize Main Street operations if truck relief route is built and FBG takes over maintenance and operations
  - Send Clinton NACTO recommended widths for bike facilities
  - Complete bike route map.

Key Discussion Points
Main Street:
- Remove center striping (6’) to allow more space for parking outside lanes
  - Keep left turn pockets at signalized intersections, though
- The value to local businesses is pedestrian activity

CIP Prioritization Tool:
- Affordable housing is important – is there a way to capture in tool?
- Explore options for riding bikes to wineries
- Need subdivision ordinance to show in MTP cross-sections.
- Jim Mikula (970-227-3324)
  - Bicycle facilities in front of planned resort? (SH 16 north of town)
  - Site has planned access to FM 1631 as well, but not primary route into resort
- Considering public reveal at Lance Armstrong event in May
  - Would a route map be a liability for the City? What about a physical map?
- There is a maintenance cost for bike lane striping.
- Is there liability for the City if a bike route map is published and accident? Need to look into
Attendees

- Dr. Eric Wright, Fredericksburg Independent School District
- Chief Steven Wetz, Fredericksburg Police Department
- Kent Myers, City of Fredericksburg
- Clinton Bailey, City of Fredericksburg
- Garret Bonn, City of Fredericksburg
- Brian Van De Walle, Kimley-Horn
- Amy Avery, Kimley-Horn
- Jake Gutekunst, Kimley-Horn

Key Discussion Points

Drone Footage:
- FISD shared drone footage of AM and PM peaks of all schools with attendees

Fredericksburg Elementary School:
- Rule of thumb: half of students are car-riders
- Will there be a crosswalk at apartments? No, no sidewalk on S. side of Adams
- Crosswalk at Adams & Crabapple needs lighting for pedestrians
  - Mark Cornette requested a signal here in the past
- Will Town Homes have access on Adams? – No, only on Lower Crabapple
  - 45 townhomes
  - 96 apartment units

Fredericksburg Middle School:
- College St – 6th grade
- Travis St – 7th/8th grade, “front”
- Sidewalk on College St – planned for Summer 2017
- Sidewalks on Adams near the school need cleaning up
Fredericksburg High School:
- New FHS entrance near Milam and SH 16
- Burger King going in at SW corner. Concerns about pedestrians crossing there at lunch for safety
  - Also, could be an issue with signal timing with new pedestrians
- Queues on Milam WB
- Approximation of students' travel modes:
  - 225 drivers
  - 350 bus riders
  - 350 parent drop-offs
- Concern for pedestrian hazards on Billie Drive
  - The lack of crosswalks may make it safer because people look both ways.
  - Consider speed bumps, striping, or a raised crosswalk
- Visited SH 16 & Milam – splits on Milam are already tight
- People are understanding of 15-minute delays, not an issue
- E Hwy St crossings are a concern. There was one pedestrian accident there in the last 1-2 years
- E Hwy at SH 16 – problem in AM with buses queuing for drop-off – new location in 2017

Fredericksburg Primary School:
- Primary school queueing on Adams
- HS to block off loop and educate drivers that there is not a drop-off on Adams
- Parents like to walk
- There are 185 kindergarteners and fewer pre-K students
  - Will be adding 1st grade to campus following year, approximately 225 students

General Notes:
- There is a growth rate (K-12) of 75-100 kids per year, current plans should allow for 10 years' growth without need for additional facilities.
- Staggered class times are one option, but employee pay is the key factor against that solution
- Ideally, FHS would start at 9 AM
- There are no roadway projects near school campuses in the CIP, only sidewalks
- The MTP is not prescriptive in nature in regards to transportation around schools, more subjective
- The only planned expansion is the FMS cafeteria in new wings
# Sign-In Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Weisenger</td>
<td>541-622-2864</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ysinger5@gmail.com">ysinger5@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-K Welcht</td>
<td>830-456-3231</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kk.majestywine.tours@yahoo.com">kk.majestywine.tours@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Taylor</td>
<td>512-783-7179</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pault@majestywine.tours">pault@majestywine.tours</a>@yahoo.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Neffendorf</td>
<td>830-456-2864</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GNEFFENDORF@TEXAS.EDU">GNEFFENDORF@TEXAS.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cord Switzer</td>
<td>830-992-9463</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wine@flagwines.com">wine@flagwines.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill &amp; Mike Holbrook</td>
<td>512-618-8344</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jill@texasselfstorage.com">jill@texasselfstorage.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelm P. Vins</td>
<td>830-299-9351</td>
<td><a href="mailto:W.VINS@GMAIL.COM">W.VINS@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Dietrich</td>
<td>806-206-6826</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rd.256511@gmail.com">rd.256511@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUANIMITY JOY</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:EQUANIMITYJOY@GMAIL.COM">EQUANIMITYJOY@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sign-In Sheet

**Project:** Fredericksburg Transportation Master Plan Update  
**Meeting Date:** Friday, January 20, 2017  
4:00 PM to 7:00 PM  
**Place:** Fredericksburg City Hall  
126 W Main Street  
Fredericksburg, TX 78624

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Salassher</td>
<td>415.990.1745</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marygallagher@brown.com">marygallagher@brown.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Travis</td>
<td>997 0961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elroy Hedler</td>
<td>998-9649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jasso</td>
<td>512-292-7280</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john@proterra-mapping.com">john@proterra-mapping.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce W.Wille</td>
<td>832 984 6556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara + Bern Kopp</td>
<td>815-732-2881</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bookworms_Kopp05@gmail.com">Bookworms_Kopp05@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Maenius</td>
<td>831 456 4335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah-Nicole Partin</td>
<td>956.238.0471</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.n.a.r.t.7.56@gmail.com">s.n.a.r.t.7.56@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sign-In Sheet

**Project:** Fredericksburg Transportation Master Plan Update  
**Meeting Date:** Friday, January 20, 2017  
4:00 PM to 7:00 PM  
**Place:** Fredericksburg City Hall  
126 W Main Street  
Fredericksburg, TX 78624  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat McGowan</td>
<td>830.997-4375</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patfmcgr@Austin.RR.com">patfmcgr@Austin.RR.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilly Wylva</td>
<td>830.456.1853</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Majestywine.tours@yahoo.com">Majestywine.tours@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody Woodruff</td>
<td>830.998-6113</td>
<td><a href="mailto:texasuncorked@yahoo.com">texasuncorked@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Burns</td>
<td>830.456.5197</td>
<td><a href="mailto:george@290wine.tours.com">george@290wine.tours.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Hangerham</td>
<td>830.456.0385</td>
<td><a href="mailto:langerham@austin.rr.com">langerham@austin.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimi Daisher</td>
<td>830.669-2751</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daisheremail@gmail.com">daisheremail@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Loeffler</td>
<td>830-997-6233</td>
<td><a href="mailto:director@flagtc.org">director@flagtc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Allen</td>
<td>810-845-8917</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Scott@FredericksburgStandard.com">Scott@FredericksburgStandard.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester Frantzze</td>
<td>830-997-4985</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LFRANTZEN@AUSTIN.RR.COM">LFRANTZEN@AUSTIN.RR.COM</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sign-In Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Amini</td>
<td>730.307.3212</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.asraji@gmail.com">m.asraji@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Mills</td>
<td>(210) 413-3028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby Watson</td>
<td>830.456.8190</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bobby@millercooper.com">bobby@millercooper.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Thompson</td>
<td>512-771-9694</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thompson12@aol.com">thompson12@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Vernon</td>
<td>830-997-8524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresa Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis W. Neffendorf</td>
<td>830-997-7503</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dneffendorf@gillespiecounty.org">dneffendorf@gillespiecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilli Perez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sign-in Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buddy Smith</td>
<td>830-997-7585</td>
<td>bsmills@گیلبرجکاءنت.اک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hartmann</td>
<td>997-6903</td>
<td><a href="mailto:djhec@kfc.com">djhec@kfc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Marie Mazanke</td>
<td>997-4967</td>
<td>rosemarie@<a href="mailto:mazanke@hotmail.com">mazanke@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Brecher</td>
<td>730-3299</td>
<td>brechr@<a href="mailto:ln@yahoo.com">ln@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Corty</td>
<td>612-226-7718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WMcORTY@Yahoo.com">WMcORTY@Yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott May</td>
<td>281-726-7960</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wktanker@gmail.com">wktanker@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Frantze</td>
<td>830-997-4985</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LFRANTZEN@custin.rr.com">LFRANTZEN@custin.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Lorenz</td>
<td>281-832-2089</td>
<td><a href="mailto:A.Lorenz@86cglobal.net">A.Lorenz@86cglobal.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeeAnn Bailey</td>
<td>830.998.0988</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lecann.bailey@me.com">lecann.bailey@me.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lisa Nye-Sallada
830-377-7190 C
8916 x 8640
990-2609 O

jylde@hotmail.com

JYL MILLER
MTC MARY BON
ROTHFELLER

830-997-6352

hillobike@kte.com

260-414-3935
SCENARIO:

Imagine you are given $100 to disperse among the 6 Goals as you see fit. Indicate how much of the $100 you would allocate to each Goal.
Priority Pyramid

- most important
- congestion
- mobility
- connectivity
- safety and welfare
- management of system
- economic development
- community character
- preservation
- implementation

- what is most important to you?
1. **Lisa Nye-Saladin**  
702 E. Main  
830-990-2609  
**Comment** – Get to or return from: Recommended cyclist routes-locals and visitors  
Lower crabapple Old San Antonio/1631/ Like Oak/ Goehmann Lake-Eberle/ Friendship Lane/ 16 N to Lower Crabapple; Advertise bike racks/visitor center/marketplace City Hall to encourage B&B guests to ride downtown; Access from LBJ Park to town for bicycles & pedestrians

2. **Jyl Miller/Dan Burns**  
311 S Lee St  
260-414-3935  
**Comment** – Oppose walking path at Baron’s Creek. Compromises security, increase in trash and dog droppings.

3. **No Name**  
**Comment** – Bike share & more visible bike racks(or accessible map of location of bike racks)

4. **No Name**  
**Comment** – Parking spots on Main St is dangerous because people back out into moving traffic.

5. **No Name**  
**Comment** – Creek to be cleaned up so that a walking trail can be created; more businesses along creek

6. **Sara Kopp**  
305 W College St  
815-732-2881  
**Comment** – The city needs more bike lanes, signs, and sidewalks.

7. **Sarah Nicole Partin**  
110 N. Milam-#110  
956-238-0471  
**Comment** – Very informative-appreciate it.Thanks.

8. **Russell & Christine Reese**  
315 South Lee St.  
713-301-4033  
**Comment** – Current plan indicates hard surface trail along the entire perimeter of our property. This is private property which extends to the centerline of the(Barons) creek. We ADAMENTLY oppose the placement of public use on our property!!!!
9. **George Burns**  
607 Lupine Ln  
830-456-5197  
Comment – Please build multi-use trails and green belt for hiking/biking around town.

10. **No Name**  
Comment –  
- Consider the wants/needs of the **RESIDENTS** over what you **think** are the wants/needs of the “weekend population”  
- Enforce the 30mph speed limit on W Austin St.  
- STOP the 18 wheelers from using W Austin St as a main street bypass

11. **Bruce W Wille**  
1000 Doe Run Hollow  
832-984-6556  
Comment – Fix the flow of traffic through total signal control locally!

12. **Scott Allen**  
308 West Schubert Street  
210-845-8917  
Comment – I really liked the idea of having both a truck route and relief route for local traffic, whatever to ease traffic off of main street will help. Another big concern I have is for the Hwy 87(Washington St) &290(Main St) intersection. That has gotten way too busy & there’s too many 18-wheelers with wind turbines turning in that intersection. It seems a little unsafe.

13. **Mary Gallagher**  
102 S Cherry St 78624  
415-990-1745  
Comment – Thanks for doing this: I would love the following - 1. Lower speed limits in & around town.  
2. Walking paths. 3. Relief route.

14. **Jill Holbrook**  
2146 Stone Oak  
512-618-8344  
Comment – 1. Parking solutions. 2. Relief route 3. Transportation solutions
15. **Equanimiti Joy & Daniel Two Eagles**  
813- Dogwood Lane.  
978-979-8978  
**Comment** –  
Relief Road ++++++  
More sidewalks! Everywhere!  
Lower the speed limit on Main St-NOW 15 MPH-Start out at W Main-All the way to E Main Hardware or Walmart-more people will stop because they feel safer!

16. **Tamesha Jumper**  
503 E Ufer  
830-997-8524  
**Comment** –  
On 2006 map-still has alternative trail through private property-please remove from plans  
Seriously need alternate route for 18 wheeler/commercial through traffic  
DO NOT advocate bike lanes anywhere in town

17. **Bill Vernon**  
503 E Ufer Street  
830-997-8524  
**Comment** –  
I am strongly against any multi-use trail going through my backyard on Baron’s Creek. I have been assured by the current city council that this will not be happening, but it is still on the planning map!

18. **Pat McGowan**  
P.O. 836  
830-997-4315  
**Comment** –  
I am in favor of the by-pass. I prefer a loop or bypass 2-3 miles from Main. This is very needed!! Thank you.

19. **Jay Mills**  
220 W Driftwood Dr.  
**Comment** –  
5 Million to spend.  
*1. Most important TODAY!!!*  
The curve(Dead Man’s Curve @ old Roadside Park) on SH16 to Kerrville. (this a highway in the city of Fredericksburg-we to push for fixing this death trap.  
2. Loop around Fredericksburg

20. **Lilli Peters**  
**Comment** –  
No bypass.
21. **Mike Holbrook**  
2461 Stone Oak  
512-677-2965  
**Comment** – Please consider a public transportation system for downtown-parking at edge/disconnect from merchants for those that use it. Convention Center at LadyBird Johnson Park on 16. Commit to future enjoyment not future pains.

*FROM CITIZEN COMMENTS (NON-PUBLIC HOUSE)*

22. **John Maralgia**  
**Comment** – Major concerns about intersection of Granite, Walnut, and Longhorn at 87 S.

23. **Marilyn Bell**  
Marilyn’s Dress Shop  
830-997-5498  
**Comment** – Fully supports relief route and would like to see it completed ASAP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Widen Road</th>
<th>Bike Lanes</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Multi-Use Trail</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$ 4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$ 4,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$ 1,600,000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$ 1,600,000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$ 1,600,000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$ 1,600,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$ 4,800,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$ 4,800,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ 1,500,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 61</td>
<td>$ 61,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ 1,500,000</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>$ 33,000,000</td>
<td>145,300,000</td>
<td>145,300,000</td>
<td>$ 145,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Prioritization Results

**Council Workshop – 3/6/17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Preservation</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Mobility</td>
<td>18.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Congestion</td>
<td>17.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Connectivity</td>
<td>17.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Community Character</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Implementation</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Safety and Welfare</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Manage Existing</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

Appendix B: Existing Plans

- 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update – Introduction & Purpose
- 2015 Sidewalk Plan
- 2006 Thoroughfare Plan
- 2016 Capital Improvements Projects (CIP) Plan – Street Dept Summary
- Parks, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan – Introduction
- 2016 Zoning Map
- Gillespie Country Relief Route Preliminary Report (No Appendices)
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An old windmill, water tower and advertisement billboard for Trade Days at Sunday Farms along US 290 in Fredericksburg, Texas
Purpose, Vision, & Goals
PURPOSE

This document is intended to support the goals and vision from the 2006 Comprehensive Plan. Each of the components of the Issues Update serves to enhance the quality of life for residents and visitors alike.

Sidewalks Plan

The Sidewalks will serve as the plan referred to in the recently adopted Subdivision Ordinance, Section 6.11.B.1. The intent of the Sidewalk Plan is to create better pedestrian access along heavily-traveled and desired routes for current and future use. The Sidewalks Plan will also connect the community to local and regional destinations including the Former Texas Rangers Heritage Center, the Hill Country University Center and Fort Martin Scott.

Gateways Plan

The Gateways Plan is intended to delineate the corridor areas that lead to and from Fredericksburg, which will fall under the Design Standards. These special entrances into Fredericksburg should enhance the character of Fredericksburg, not detract. The Gateways Plan describes a family of elements in each of the city’s six gateways. Each of the gateways is unique in their character; the family of elements reflects this individuality.

Design Standards

The Design Standards are intended to provide guidance to developers on how to create character in the entry corridors. As properties redevelop over time, Fredericksburg’s character will become more and more defined, helping to protect the value inherent in this beloved city. The Design Standards will be applied to all of the entry corridors into town, as illustrated in the Design Standards Chapter.
Figure 3: Study Area
STUDY AREA

The Study Area identified for this plan encompasses the primary entries into Fredericksburg as well as the area outside the City Limits encompassed by the City’s ETJ. The ETJ includes the area within one mile of the current city limits. This is the area where the City can annex and grow as development occurs. Because of this, cities have some authority to manage growth in this area through the application of the Subdivision Ordinance. This ensures building in the ETJ meets city standards, so when it is annexed there is no need for improvements to bring things to city code.

The Comprehensive Plan uses the ETJ as the study area boundary, and thus this is the designated study area of the Issues Update. The decision to include the ETJ in this project was to ensure that the City sidewalks connect to the region. In addition, much of the development along the designated entry corridors will occur in the ETJ, so there will need to be coordination with the standards defined in this plan. The coordinated development along entry corridors will create a unique character into town that supports the overall image of Fredericksburg.
The Fredericksburg Comprehensive Plan Issues Update is a supplemental document to the Fredericksburg Comprehensive Plan 2006 and will serve as the statement of policy and priority that guides the City in their consideration of development proposals and investment in capital improvements.

The Comprehensive Plan Issues Update provides a shared statement of direction for the decisions that help achieve the desired community future.
GOALS

The project goals support the Comprehensive Plan and support the existing goals that were determined during for the initial Comprehensive planning process.

Several goals were identified from The Comprehensive Plan that support each of the Issues Update initiatives. Each of the goals are listed below.

Sidewalks Plan

Goal 6: Neighborhoods that appeal to families and create a next generation of Fredericksburg residents and civic leaders.

Goal 7: Neighborhoods that are connected – literally and figuratively – to the life of the entire Fredericksburg community.

Goal 19: Protection of important natural resources.

Goal 26: Adequate levels of public facilities and service available to existing development and to new development when it is occupied.

Goal 34: A range of mobility choices available to Fredericksburg residents, business employees, and visitors.

Goal 35: A network of sidewalks, paths and designated lanes that allows residents to walk or bicycle within neighborhoods, to and within the Central Business District and to other key locations.

Gateways Plan

Goal 11: A tourism sector that is based on Fredericksburg’s natural and historic character and that in turn helps to retain and enhance the features that make this community a special place to live and visit.

Goal 15: A community that preserves and celebrates its historic German, Hispanic and Texan heritage.

Goal 17: Community design features and development patterns at the community’s edge that communicate one’s arrival into Fredericksburg.

“Adding a little bit more sidewalk would allow for a two way bicycle/walking path along Friendship Lane for residents to get to the High School.”
GOALS

Design Standards

Goal 12: A mix of retail businesses that meets the needs of Fredericksburg’s residents as well as visitors.

Goal 20: Development patterns that incorporate the natural features of this Hill Country setting.

Goal 22: A community that is a leader in ‘green’ design.

Goal 23: An orderly pattern of development that accommodates anticipated growth while maintaining Fredericksburg’s character.

Goal 29: Development and investment in the Airport Focus Area that supports the operations of Gillespie County Airport and builds on the assets of the airport, Lady Bird Johnson Park and Golf Course to form a major employment center for the community and an attraction for visitors to the region.

Goal 30: A Health Focus Area that provides a coordinated center of high quality health care, wellness, and residential assisted care that serves the entire Hill County region.

Goal 33: Continuing growth and new development that maintains the existing community’s character.
HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

Each chapter is organized by topic: Sidewalks Plan, Gateways Plan, and Design Standards. Within each chapter the following information is included:

- Overview;
- Existing Conditions Analysis;
- Recommendations; and
- Implementation Strategy.
City of Fredericksburg
Sidewalk Plan - 2015
Adopted by City Council: June 1, 2015

Legend
- Proposed Sidewalks
- Existing Sidewalks
- Historic District

1 inch = 1,000 feet

NOT TO SCALE
City of Fredericksburg

Capital Improvement Plan

Fleet & Equipment Replacement Plan

FY2016
Street Department
Summary

5 Year Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>5,425,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0-5 Year Total: $4,960,000

>5 Year Total: $5,425,000

TOTAL Allocation for Street Capital Improvements: $10,385,000
Street Department Projects

- Capital Improvements Projects include new street sections, street reconstruction, sidewalk installation, and intersection realignments in various locations throughout the City based on need and the existing Thoroughfare Plan.

- Total need over 20 years: $10,385,000
**City of Fredericksburg**  
**Proposed Capital Improvement Plan - Fleet & Equipment Replacement Plan**  
Revision Date: September 15, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STREET DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Orange Street Improvements</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Brehemer Lane</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Main Street Sidewalk Repairs</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>South Milam Street Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Post Oak Road Extension (Live Oak to Windcrest)</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Sidewalk Improvements - East Ufer Street</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Master Thoroughfare Plan</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Sunrise Street Extension (Mustang to Dawn)</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Sunrise Street Extension (Columbus to Eagle)</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>East Morse Street &amp; Bridge</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Morning Glory Drive Extension</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>South Cherry Street Extension</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Live Oak Street / Adams Street Intersection Re-alignment</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>Frederick Rd Extension (Hwy 16 to 1631)</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>Frederick Rd Extension (1631 to 290 East)</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Street CIP Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 610,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,600,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,425,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 10,385,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Possible Bond Project

**Fleet & Equipment**

- Flat Wheel Roller | Street | $ - |
- 8 Yd International Dump Truck | Street | $ - |
- Fleet Lease - 5 Maintenance Trucks (FY2015 Replacements) | Street | $ 30,500 | $ 30,500 | $ 30,500 | $ 30,500 | $ 122,000 |
- Replace 1999 International Dump Truck #75 Patch Truck | Street | $ - |
- Replace 2000 International Oil Truck (Distributor) | Street | $ 52,700 | $ 52,700 | $ 105,400 |
- Fleet Lease - 1 Maintenance Trucks (FY2016 Replacements) | Street | $ 6,000 | $ 6,000 | $ 6,000 | $ 6,000 | $ 30,000 |
- Replace 1993 International Dump Truck - 14 Yd - add conveyor | Street | $ 42,000 | $ 42,000 | $ 42,000 | $ 126,000 |
- Replace 1983 GMC Haul Truck with Trailer for dump truck | Street | $ 28,000 | | $ 28,000 |
- Replace 1976 Tractor & Loader with Bobcat | Street | $ 22,000 | $ 22,000 | $ 22,000 | $ 66,000 |
- Replace Thermoplastic Striping Machine | Street | $ 30,000 | | $ 30,000 |
- Replace 1998 Sand Spreader Attachment | Street | $ 12,500 | | $ 12,500 |
- Replace 1991 Tractor for Shredder | Street | $ 40,000 | | $ 40,000 |
- Fleet Lease - 1 Maintenance Truck (FY2017 Replacement) | Street | $ 7,200 | $ 7,200 | $ 7,200 | $ 7,200 | $ 7,200 | $ 36,000 |
- Replace 1999 Ford Dump Truck #51 (5500 Flat Bed) | Street | $ 55,000 | | $ 55,000 |
- Replace 1986 Dump Truck | Street | $ 90,000 | | $ 90,000 |
- Replace Striping Machine | Street | $ 15,000 | | $ 15,000 |
- Replace 1991 Tool Carrier | Street | $ 250,000 | | $ 250,000 |
- Replace 2002 Tractor | Street | $ 42,000 | | $ 42,000 |
- Replace 2009 Tymco Street Sweeper | Street | $ 190,000 | | $ 190,000 |
- Replace 1995 International Dump Truck #68 - 8 Yd | Street | $ 100,000 | | $ 100,000 |
- Replace 1996 Double Shredder Center Mount | Street | $ 7,500 | | $ 7,500 |

- 27 -
## Proposed Capital Improvement Plan - Fleet & Equipment Replacement Plan

**Revision Date:** September 15, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1990 International Dump Truck - 14 Yd</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1996 International Dump Truck #74 - 14 YD</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Steam Pressure Washer</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1987 Chevy C60 Truck - Water Truck</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Lease - 1 Maintenance Truck (FY2019 Replacement)</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$22,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1988 Grader</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1995 4WD Loader</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1997 Truck Conveyor, Sander Attachment, &amp; Pump</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1998 McConnel Rear Mount Mower (Slope Shredder)</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1999 Motor Grader #S-21</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2000 International Dump Truck #76 - 14 YD</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2002 Etnyre Chipspreader #S-9</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2004 Water Truck with Tank #56</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2004 Pneumatic Roller #S-7</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2001 Rotary Cut Shredder #S-23</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2005 Tractor</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1995 Bucket Truck</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 1993 Caterpillar Track Type Tractor</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$171,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$171,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2010 Crack Sealer #S-22</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2008 Pneumatic Roller</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street Fleet & Equipment Totals**

| $263,700 | $802,400 | $545,200 | $543,600 | $615,600 | $737,400 | $3,507,900 |

**Street Department Totals**

| $763,700 | $1,412,400 | $1,545,200 | $2,143,600 | $1,865,600 | $6,162,400 | $13,892,900 |
**Project Summary Information**

**Date:** 6/17/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID #:</th>
<th>S1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Orange Street Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>100 Block North Orange Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Year Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>38,597</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$63,597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

- General Fund - Street Dept: $63,597

**Project Description**

This project includes the complete rebuild of the 100 block of North Orange Street. This includes stabilizing subgrade, new base, installation of curbs, sidewalks, and some drainage improvements.

**Project Justification**

Base and subgrade failure caused pavement failure.

**O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed**

Project has been completed.

**Notes**
Project Summary Information

Date: 6/17/2015

Project ID #: S2
Project Name: Sidewalk Improvements
Project Location: Various Locations

Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$107,107</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$2,007,107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

General Fund - Street Dept | $ 2,007,107

Project Description

Build sidewalks in areas to facilitate pedestrian access. Program will allocate $100,000 per year to construct sidewalks as designated on the Sidewalk Plan as approved by the City Council. Length of sidewalk to be limited to $100,000 in construction cost.

Project Justification

A Sidewalk Plan has been adopted by the City Council as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

Notes
### Project Summary Information

**Project ID #:** S3  
**Project Name:** Brehmer Lane  
**Project Location:** Brehmer Lane from Highway Street to Sunrise Street

### Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

- **General Fund - Street Dept**  
  $ 350,000

### Project Description

This project will require the existing street to be completely reconstructed along with curbing along both sides.

### Project Justification

Brehmer Lane is an existing City street with very poor pavement and no curbing. Development is now taking place along Brehmer Lane requiring the street to be built.

### O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

### Notes
CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

Project Summary Information
Date: 6/17/2015
Project ID #: S4
Project Name: Main Street Sidewalk Repairs
Project Location: Various Locations Along Main Street

Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

General Fund - Street Dept $ 500,000

Project Description

Repair sidewalks along Main Street including concrete, curbs, islands, and pavers in disrepair. Program will allocate $50,000 per year for repairs.

Project Justification

The City has filed many insurance claims regarding pedestrians who have been injured when they tripped and/or fell due to an offset in the sidewalk, misaligned pavers, or tree grate displacement. These incidents have been happening for several years.

O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

Notes
# Project Summary Information

**Date:** 6/17/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID #:</th>
<th>SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong></td>
<td>South Milam Street Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Location:</strong></td>
<td>South Milam Street from Fulton to Highway 16 South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Funding Sources

- General Fund - Street Dept $350,000

## Project Description

Rehabilitation of South Milam Street from Fulton to Highway 16 South would include the milling of the existing pavement and overlaying with 1 1/2" of hotmix.

## Project Justification

South Milam Street is showing signs of stress and deterioration between Fulton Street and Highway 16 South. Deterioration of the pavement is allowing water to penetrate into the subgrade through cracks.

## O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

## Notes
**Project Summary Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID #:</th>
<th>S6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Post Oak Road Extension (Live Oak to Windcrest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>Post Oak Road from Live Oak to Windcrest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Year Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

| General Fund - Street Dept | $ 300,000 |

**Project Description**

The project includes the construction of Post Oak Road to make the connection from West Live Oak Street to West Windcrest Street. This project includes construction of the street and curbs.

**Project Justification**

This project would connect Post Oak Road from West Live Oak Street to West Windcrest Street. No additional right-of-way should be required for this project. 1,000 feet is existing county road right-of-way. The remaining 600 feet is part of an agreement with the Oaks of Windcrest Developer. Post Oak Road is designated as a Collector Type Street on the current Thoroughfare Plan.

**O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed**

**Notes**

---

CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN
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**Project Summary Information**

**Project ID #:** S7  
**Project Name:** Sidewalk Improvements - East Ufer Street  
**Project Location:** 200 Block of East Ufer

**Fiscal Year Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

- General Fund - Street Dept: $40,000

**Project Description**

Construction of sidewalks to facilitate pedestrian access in the area around the proposed Wine & Culinary Arts development. Approximately 1,040 LF of 5 foot wide sidewalk along South Llano, East Ufer, and South Lincoln would be constructed.

**Project Justification**


**O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed**


**Notes**


**CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG**

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN**

### Project Summary Information

- **Project ID #:** S8
- **Project Name:** Master Thoroughfare Plan
- **Project Location:** N/A

### Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

- General Fund - Street Dept: $120,000

### Project Description

Development of an updated Master Thoroughfare Plan for the City that evaluates all existing and proposed rights-of-way, streets, bicycle routes, pedestrian routes, and sidewalks.

### Project Justification

The most recent Master Thoroughfare Plan was created in 2006 with an update to the Comprehensive Plan. Several of the proposed streets on this Master Thoroughfare Plan have been constructed.

### O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

- **Notes**
# Project Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>6/17/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project ID #:</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Sunrise Street Extension (Mustang to Dawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>Sunrise Street from Mustang to Dawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Funding Sources
- General Fund - Street Dept: $ 500,000

## Project Description
The project includes the construction of Sunrise Street to make the connection from Mustang Street to Dawn Lane. This project includes construction of the street and curbs.

## Project Justification
This project would connect Sunrise Street from Mustang Street to Dawn Lane. Sunrise Street is designated as a Collector Type Street on the current Thoroughfare Plan.

## O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

## Notes
Sunrise Street Extension (Columbus to Eagle)

**Project Summary Information**

- **Project ID #**: S10
- **Project Name**: Sunrise Street Extension (Columbus to Eagle)
- **Project Location**: Sunrise Street from Columbus to Eagle

**Fiscal Year Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

- General Fund - Street Dept $ 350,000

**Project Description**

The project includes the construction of Sunrise Street to make the connection from South Columbus Street to South Eagle Street. This project includes construction of the street and curbs.

**Project Justification**

This project would connect Sunrise Street from South Columbus Street to South Eagle Street. Sunrise Street is designated as a Collector Type Street on the current Thoroughfare Plan.

**O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed**

**Notes**

- CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG
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# Project Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID #</th>
<th>S11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>East Morse Street Extension and Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>East Morse Street to RR 1631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 875,000</td>
<td>$ 875,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

| Bond Funds | $ 875,000 |

## Project Description

The project includes the construction of East Morse Street to make the connection from the current end of East Morse Street to RR 1631. This project includes construction of the street, curbs, and a bridge. All right-of-way is in place. Water and sewer utilities are also in place.

## Project Justification

This project would extend East Morse Street to RR 1631. East Morse Street is designated as a Collector Type Street on the current Thoroughfare Plan.

## O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

### Notes

- No additional notes provided.
Project Summary Information

Date: 6/17/2015

Project ID #: S13
Project Name: Morning Glory Drive Extension
Project Location: Morning Glory Drive from Lower Crabapple to Ridgewood Drive

Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

Bond Funds $ 450,000

Project Description

This project would include the extension of Morning Glory Drive from Lower Crabapple Road to Ridgewood Drive.

Project Justification

This project would extend Morning Glory Drive from Lower Crabapple Road to Ridgewood Drive. Morning Glory Drive along with this extension are designated as a Collector Type Street on the current Thoroughfare Plan.

O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

Notes
## Project Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project ID #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
<td>S14</td>
<td>South Cherry Street Extension</td>
<td>South Cherry Street from West Creek Street to the intersection of South Bowie Street and Post Oak Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

| Bond Funds | $ 800,000 |

### Project Description

This project would include the extension of South Cherry Street from West Creek Street to the intersection of South Bowie Street and Post Oak Road.

### Project Justification

This project would extend South Cherry Street from West Creek Street to the intersection of South Bowie Street and Post Oak Road. South Cherry Street, along with this extension, and Post Oak Road, are designated as Collector Type Streets on the current Thoroughfare Plan.

### O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

### Notes
Project Summary Information

Date: 6/17/2015

Project ID #: S15
Project Name: Live Oak Street / Adams Street Intersection Re-alignment
Project Location: Intersection of Live Oak Street and South Adams Street

Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

General Fund - Street Dept $300,000

Project Description

This project would include the realignment of the intersection of Live Oak Street and South Adams Street. Right-of-way acquisition would be required on the east side of the intersection.

Project Justification

There is a major offset in Live Oak Street at the intersection of South Adams Street. A traffic signal on South Adams owned and operated by TxDOT at times causes traffic to stack on South Adams Street, which impedes visibility and makes maneuverability from East Live Oak Street heading west onto South Adams dangerous.

O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

Notes
CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

Project Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>Frederick Road Extention (Hwy 16 North to RR 1631)</td>
<td>Frederick Road from Hwy 16 North to RR 1631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 9/15/2015

Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

| Bond Funds | $1,000,000 |

Project Description

This project would include the extension of Frederick Road from Highway 16 North to RR 1631 as identified on the existing Thoroughfare Plan.

Project Justification

This project would extend Frederick Road from Highway 16 North to RR 1631. This extension of Frederick Road is designated as a Major Arterial Type Street on the current Thoroughfare Plan.

O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed

Notes
Project Summary Information

Project ID #: S17
Project Name: Frederick Road Extention (RR 1631 to 290 East)
Project Location: Frederick Road from RR 1631 to Hwy 290 East

Fiscal Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

- Bond Funds $ 3,000,000

Project Description

This project would include the extension of Frederick Road from RR 1631 to Hwy 290 East at the intersection of Friendship Lane as identified on the existing Thoroughfare Plan.

Project Justification

This project would extend Frederick Road from RR 1631 to Hwy 290 East at the intersection of Friendship Lane. This extension of Frederick Road is designated as a Major Arterial Type Street on the current Thoroughfare Plan.

O&M Impact if Project is Not Completed
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INTRODUCTION

The City of Fredericksburg is a growing community within the Texas Hill Country. This growth necessitates the need for advance planning to ensure that municipal service systems, including parks and recreation, keep pace with increasing demands upon these systems. In the last 20 years, parks and open space planning has become a specialized area within the overall municipal planning structure. The existing population of Fredericksburg is 11,500 and is expected to continue growing to a built-out population of 21,000. With this population increase, the acquisition and development of parks and open space areas will be significant factors in maintaining a high quality of life for citizens in Fredericksburg. These growth characteristics indicate that the City should continue taking a “hands-on” approach in guiding the development of the City.

PREVIOUS PLANNING STUDIES

The City of Fredericksburg’s current Park Master Plan was prepared in 2006 in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan. Because of the growth of the Fredericksburg area, the City Manager and Director of Parks and Recreation decided to prepare a new Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan. Therefore, the City employed a private consulting firm to prepare the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan.

The City of Fredericksburg is experiencing moderate residential and commercial growth. The Texas Hill Country has become a residential retirement area, wine tourism destination and is known for their downtown retail shopping on Main Street. Because of Fredericksburg’s location in the Texas Hill Country and due to its growing population, the City determined it is necessary to evaluate the City’s park system, park needs and park land acquisition, leading to the creation of this Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan.
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals provide a statement for achievement or accomplishment. Objectives are a perceived means through which the goal(s) can be partially or fully attained. Identified within this section are the ways and methods of implementing the Parks, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan recommendations. Critical to the implementation of these goals and objectives is the Five-Year Action Plan, which should be updated annually by City Staff and the City Council.

The following are the goals and objectives for the Fredericksburg park system:

**GOAL 1: A system of outstanding parks and open space area which are responsive to the leisure needs of a growing community and sensitive to the conservation of natural resources.**

1.1 The City should increase quality recreational opportunities for Fredericksburg citizens.

1.2 The City should encourage and conserve natural areas of Lady Bird Johnson Park, native habitat, wildlife, creek corridors, and wooded areas so as to enrich the local quality of life.

1.3 The City should seek the donation of land for parks, open space, greenways and floodplains.

1.4 The City should administer development and construction guidelines which result in minimal destruction of native and wildlife habitats along key creek corridors and open space areas.

**GOAL 2: Recreational facilities, programs and park areas that meet the needs of a diverse population with various levels of ability and skill.**

2.1 The City should recognize the special needs of youth, teens, adults, the elderly, and handicapped when designating and providing recreational facilities.

**GOAL 3: An equitable geographic distribution of parks and recreational facilities.**

3.1 The City should acquire necessary parkland and open space at the time of development review in accordance with the classification of parks identified by the Parks Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

**GOAL 4: Orderly replacement and/or re-design of aging parks and recreational infrastructure to ensure existing recreational opportunities are not lost.**

4.1 The City should continue to upgrade existing park and athletic facilities and playgrounds in order to provide a safe open space environment.
4.2 The City should pursue land acquisition for development of active recreational opportunities such as baseball, softball, soccer and football for youth and adults.

GOAL 5: Cooperation with the school district, county and other agencies, as well as community organizations, to provide cost-effective services and optimize benefits to citizens.

5.1 The City and the Fredericksburg Independent School District should work together to promote the integrated development of schools and park sites.

5.2 The City should seek joint financing of new recreational and athletic facilities with the Fredericksburg Independent School District.

5.3 The City should seek joint financing of new recreational and athletic facilities with Gillespie County.

GOAL 6: A Comprehensive Trail System that meets the needs of Fredericksburg residents.

6.1 The City should identify the various types of trails – multi-purpose trail, serving recreational needs (for instance along a natural feature), or connector trail, serving transportation purposes. Paving standards and other design features should be adopted for construction of both types.

6.2 The City should identify opportunities for using trails to linking key locations within Fredericksburg. Such trails should connect city parks and landmarks to the Downtown area. Trails should connect neighborhoods to destinations within the neighborhood, as well as, to major public facilities and key destinations.

POLICIES AND ORDINANCES

The effectiveness of these implementation mechanisms is dependent upon the proper coordination of input from contributing bodies or groups including elected City officials - appointed boards and commissions - City staff, sports groups, and most importantly the citizens of Fredericksburg. All parties must communicate and work collectively toward common goals. Only this sort of communication and coordination will ensure successful development of the park system. An example of this communication, at the staff level, would be the incorporation of the Parks, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan during review of proposed development plans by the City.
PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The City Council recognized the need for a comprehensive analysis of the park system in Fredericksburg. In 2015, City employed a private consulting firm (Dunkin Sims Stoffels, Inc.) to prepare a new Parks, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan. The consultant worked with the City of Fredericksburg administrative staff to develop this Master Plan.

Meetings were held with the Fredericksburg Parks & Recreation Department staff to examine collected needs, findings and preliminary recommendations. To obtain a comprehensive and complete analysis of the City’s park and recreation needs, and park system, three methodologies were used for this evaluation: a public input meeting, surveys mailed with utility bills, and a standards-based analysis.

The Master Plan provides the City long-range planning for future areas of development for the next 10 years (2026). The time period of the financial plan, as set forth in this Master Plan (specifically within the Implementation sub-section) is five years. The prioritization listing identifies certain projections as high priorities for development with the priorities based on satisfying a stipulated/recognized need. The service area studied for the Parks, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan is within the City Limits of Fredericksburg.
GILLESPIE COUNTY RELIEF ROUTE
PRELIMINARY REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

November 2015
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Introduction

The following report is intended to summarize discussions that have taken place over the past two years on the need for a Gillespie County Relief Route. This report is also intended to provide recommendations on the next steps in the planning and design of this new roadway that should be taken over the next several years.

A 10-member Relief Route Task Force has facilitated most of the discussions regarding the Relief Route. This advisory committee (see Appendix A) was appointed by the Gillespie County Commissioners Court and the City of Fredericksburg City Council. The Task Force has held monthly meetings since September, 2013. Following presentation of this report to the City Council and County Commissioners, this Task Force intends to continue working on the planning and design of the Relief Route.
Background Information

Discussions on the need for a relief route, or highway loop, have taken place in the Gillespie County area for many years. These discussions have involved officials from the Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT), Gillespie County and the City of Fredericksburg. In 1986, TXDOT approved a Minute Order supporting a bypass route and identifying the role of the City and County in facilitating the development of this roadway. This Minute Order was cancelled after the City and County did not accept the terms of the order.

There have also been a number of public presentations on various designs and locations for this roadway. These meetings and discussions have not been successful in reaching final decisions on the route location, funding and other project details due to a number of reasons. These include the impact that the new roadway may have to property owners along the route, concerns about the design plans, highway access restrictions and funding arrangements.

As traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 290 and congestion in downtown Fredericksburg have continued to increase, the need for a Relief Route has become a critical safety issue for the community. With this in mind, the City, County and a number of local organizations have adopted resolutions supporting the need to study the feasibility of constructing a new State highway that would provide an alternate route for traffic around the downtown area. These resolutions of support are included as Appendix B.

Following adoption of these resolutions, Gillespie County Commissioners, and the City of Fredericksburg City Council appointed the 10-member Relief Route Task Force in 2013. This Task Force established its mission as “to identify the need and develop a viable solution for a Fredericksburg traffic relief route in order that our citizens may discern true information, which may ultimately lead to a vote on this important community topic.”
Recent Reports

During some 25 meetings over the past two years, the Task Force has reviewed and considered an assortment of different information and studies. One of the first reports considered was prepared by the City’s previous Acting Public Works Director, Walter Ragsdale, P.E. Mr. Ragsdale has an extensive traffic planning and design background in the State of Texas. He reviewed the current and projected traffic flows on U.S. Highway 290 in Fredericksburg’s downtown area and determined that “within 5-6 years the average daily traffic flow (will) exceed capacity.” He related several outcomes that would occur when this capacity is exceeded including (1) crash rates will increase for both vehicles and pedestrians; (2) longer emergency response times will occur; (3) traffic will seek alternate routes which will sometimes involve residential neighborhoods; and (4) there will be a negative impact on economic development in the City and County.

In 2014, the City and County were awarded a grant from the Texas Department of Public Safety to develop a Hazardous Material Commodity Flow Study. This grant was implemented via a contract with the Texas A&M Transportation Institute with a matching share provided by the community in terms of volunteer hours. The goal of the study was to collect, evaluate, and document hazardous materials transported through the community. The results of the study have provided a factual basis for local emergency and community planning.

One of the key activities involved with this study was to collect data on large trucks passing through the downtown area at several major intersections. Findings of the study include the following:

1. Between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. a countable truck will pass by approximately every 60 seconds.
2. On U.S. 290 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. a countable truck will pass by approximately every 45-50 seconds.
3. The busiest intersection is U.S. 290 at U.S. 87S.
4. The most common truck type is a bulk carrier (dump truck, grain truck, bulk materials carrier, etc.) that is probably hauling sand, gypsum, etc.
Roadway Location and Design Issues

During the past two years, a technical subcommittee of the Relief Route Task Force has been working with an engineering consultant, Greg Haley P.E., to identify, discuss and make initial decisions on a number of preliminary roadway location and design issues. Both the Area Engineer and District Engineer for TXDOT have been involved in many of these discussions. This subcommittee has made a number of different recommendations to the full Task Force that have been approved.

First of all, it has been recommended that two different alternate routes be considered for the ultimate design and construction of the Relief Route. As shown on Figure 1, route options include using a portion of Friendship Lane which should reduce the overall construction costs of the roadway in the future. The Task Force has identified a general study area west of the City. The study area is bounded generally by Post Oak Road to the east and Kerr Road to the west. The Task Force proposes future Public Meetings to present the study area and to solicit public comment. Upon receipt of public comment, the Task Force will evaluate the comments and then further define proposed recommended route options. The design of the roadway has been discussed at several subcommittee meetings with input from TXDOT. The preferred design (which is shown in Figure 2) will require right-of-way acquisition of 140 feet.
PROPOSED RURAL SECTION ACCOMMODATES FUTURE EXPANSION
Task Force Recommendations

Over the past two years, the Task Force has considered a number of different factors that illustrate the need for a Relief Route in the Fredericksburg area. This includes population growth, traffic counts, truck traffic and pedestrian traffic in the downtown area. The Relief Route is needed due to major concerns about safety for both vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic. It is also needed to facilitate the delivery of emergency services in the Fredericksburg area and to provide opportunities for economic growth in Gillespie County.

Based upon these factors and information from recent reports, it is the recommendation of the Task Force that concerted efforts be taken to plan, design and construct a Relief Route over the next several years. Specific recommendations include the following:

1. This draft report should be presented to the County Commissioners and City Council prior to the end of 2015 for their review, proposed changes, and approval.

2. Once the Commissioners and City Council approve this report, it should then be presented to the general public to update them on the progress over the past two years.

3. The report should then be presented to the State Highway Commission with a request to issue another Minute Order documenting the State’s commitment to this project.

4. The Task Force should formally request that TXDOT conduct a preliminary environmental assessment of the corridor study limits.

5. The City and County should allocate funding to hire a right-of-way agent to prepare cost estimates for the acquisition of necessary right-of-way within these corridors.

6. The Relief Route should be included in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP)
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INTRODUCTION

Barons Creek
Barons Creek is located south of Main Street and provides opportunities for recreation and wildlife habitat.
Introduction
PROJECT HISTORY

The City of Fredericksburg adopted their existing Comprehensive Plan in January 2006. Many of the Comprehensive Plan’s recommendations have been implemented, which speaks highly to the dedication of City staff, Council and Planning and Zoning Commission. The remaining items to be implemented will be carried out in this Comprehensive Plan Issues Update (Issues Update).

The Issues Update will cover the following sections:

- **Sidewalks Plan** - the need for the Sidewalks plan was discussed as part of the Capital Improvement Plan. The Plan is intended to provide linkage to major community destinations, such as schools, parks, museums, University Center and the downtown area. It will also provide linkage between existing sidewalks deemed as current and future priorities.

- **Gateways Plan** - one of the 2006 Comprehensive Plan goals was to establish “community design features and development patterns at the community’s edge that communicate one’s arrival into Fredericksburg”. This goal will be addressed in the Issues Update.

- **Design Standards and Guidelines for Entry Corridors (Design Standards)** - Fredericksburg has a set of design guidelines in the Historic District. However, the Comprehensive Plan recommended that “the City should consider design standards or guidelines to address additional key area of the community.” This includes the design along major corridors, near major destinations and buildings adjacent to the Historic District.
EXISTING PLANNING EFFORTS

The City of Fredericksburg has recognized the importance of good planning to guide the growth and development of the community. The current planning effort is a continuation of the Comprehensive Plan created in 2006, and represents one of the final sections of that plan to be implemented. This section will review the existing plans from local and regional entities that may impact this planning effort and the future development of Fredericksburg.

Local Planning Efforts

2006 Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan was developed as a tool to guide public policy to implement a common vision. The Comprehensive Plan was based on extensive public engagement and coordination with an Advisory Committee to ensure it reflected the issues and priorities of Fredericksburg residents. The Comprehensive Plan incorporated five elements: Livability, Land use, Growth, Transportation and Parks and Recreation. Within these five elements, opportunities and challenges were identified along with specific recommendations to address them.
EXISTING PLANNING EFFORTS

This Issues Update is the implementation of several goals identified from the Comprehensive Plan. This includes the following:

- Create New Patterns for Development along Major Transportation Corridors – this plan is intended to create ‘gateways’ into Fredericksburg along the major corridors.
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility – this plan will create new connections and opportunities for pedestrian access within Fredericksburg and connections to the surrounding area.

The Comprehensive Plan has served Fredericksburg well, as City leaders have embraced it and focused on implementing the recommendations within it.

2013 Subdivision Ordinance Update

The City adopted the an update to the Subdivision Ordinance in March 2014. The updates will allow the ordinance to serve as a tool to continue implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. The Subdivision Ordinance establishes the process for development within the city and also the Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ). It provides the authority for the City to manage development in such a way that protects the health and welfare of residents and ensure quality development.
Regional Planning Efforts

**TxDOT Austin Area Bicycle Plan**
Bicycling in the Texas Hill Country is increasing in popularity, and weekends often find rural roads crowded with cyclists. TxDOT has recognized this, and is in the process of developing a Bicycle Plan for the 11 counties of the Austin District. This plan is intended to provide an inventory of existing conditions in the region, prioritize corridors for improvements and address barriers to cycling.

Fredericksburg serves as a hub for the Hill Country, and has become a popular destination for bicyclists. These visitors represent an opportunity to grow the tourism market in Fredericksburg by becoming a bicycle friendly destination and serving this growing population. The recommendations in this plan will serve to improve conditions within Fredericksburg, as well as tie into the regional planning efforts to connect Fredericksburg to the surrounding wineries and other destinations.

**Regional Roadway Improvements**
http://www.txdot.gov/apps-cq/project_tracker/projects.htm?view=cnty&dist=Austin&cnty=Gillespie
In addition to planning efforts, there are a number of projects underway that may impact Fredericksburg and the gateways into the community. There is significant construction east of town on US 290, which will make this area more accessible, and potentially create incentive for more development in this area. Improvements along US 87 south of town will likely have a similar impact, creating more access and potentially more development in this gateway area. Finally, widening of SH16 will impact the area leading from Fredericksburg to Kerrville, a busy commuter corridor and key entry into town.

**Hill Country Underground Water Conservation District Management Plan 2013**
The Underground Water Conservation District is tasked with protecting and enhancing groundwater resources in Gillespie County. The mission is to protect groundwater users while maintaining economic vitality of the community. The District adopted a plan in 2013 that identifies existing conditions of the aquifer as well as desired future conditions. The plan identifies rainwater harvesting and conservation as goals, an area that the City of Fredericksburg may be able to participate in through encouraging these practices in new development in the city.
PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Fredericksburg has a history of following through on their planning efforts and committing the necessary resources to turn a plan vision into reality. This planning effort is a continuation of the 2006 Comprehensive Plan and will result in the final pieces of that plan being completed.

Each chapter includes the methods for prioritization and implementation of each portion of the Issues Update. Suggestions and guidelines for the implementation of the Sidewalks Plan, Gateways Plan, and Design Standards are located at the conclusion of each chapter.

PLAN TIMEFRAME AND UPDATES

The recommendations in the Issues Update will not be implemented over night. It will take a long term commitment to be successful. To ensure the Issues Update stays on target, it should be reviewed on an annual basis. This will allow City leaders to evaluate progress and determine if further update is needed based on current and expected activities, population changes, and other factors. This review should be part of the budget process so funding can be made where needed. The Comprehensive Plan and Issues Update should also be reviewed when there is a significant event or activity that may impact the Plans. An example would be if a major development project were proposed in an entry corridor, it would be important to review the Comprehensive Plan and Issues Update if needed to reflect that activity.
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

Successful implementation of the Issues Update will require City leadership; however, there must be coordination with TxDOT, Gillespie County, the School District, as well as private developers and businesses. The Technical Advisory Committee created for this project represents these groups, and this group may be appropriate to task with continued involvement in its implementation. This will ensure the necessary players are at the table and can contribute to decision making. It will be important to utilize the material in this plan as a guide for implementation to ensure proper resources are committed and necessary steps are taken for success. As the City moves forward with developing sidewalks, it will be especially important to reach out to property owners to gain their support for the efforts.

The City of Fredericksburg, along with TxDOT, Gillespie County, the School District, private developers, and the community will be vital to the plans success.

US 290
Gateway into Fredericksburg
Appendix C: Additional Information

- 2017 Thoroughfare Plan Update
- Bike Route Map
This map represents the 2006 Thoroughfare Plan updated to reflect projects already completed as well as new projects identified.