

1. In the future, engage with interested citizen community leaders in a more meaningful way, and allow more time for input and consideration of that input prior to formal action. The large scope of the plan (impacting about 2MM people daily, driving/walking/bicycling), the length of the document (over 300 pages), and precedent of a new plan where there was none before -- all of these warranted a longer period than the ~30 days provided. Specifically, we request the following:

- a. Responses from CAMPO staff to each of these items within 30 days of receipt of this recommendation.
- b. CAMPO staff to provide details on timeline and process for submission, discussion and adoption of amendments to the RATP.

This round of public comment period went from August 21 to September 21, a total of 30 days, which is standard. CAMPO began the RATP process over a year ago and had multiple opportunities for public comment including last winter's efforts that included numerous open houses, presentations to groups including the Bicycle Advisory Council, special events, surveys done on transit lines and in communities throughout the region, and online outreach efforts throughout the life of the project.

Additionally, as has been discussed with some members of the BAC and PAC, because of CAMPO's call for projects in early 2018, an extension of the comment period could put in jeopardy local jurisdiction's preparation and ability to submit projects in the RATP for CAMPO funding.

Updates to projects for the RATP will be done via the Project Viewer currently in the works. The Project Viewer will be the dynamic resource to show changes and additions to various projects in CAMPO's planning documents.

2. The network density of routes as shown in the Priority Network (p. 1-20) does not reflect the gradation of Composite Demand shown in the Areas of High Demand and Needs (p. 1-15).

a. Central Austin shows the highest Composite Demand, but Central Austin has a network density lower than Georgetown, Round Rock, Cedar Park, Marble Falls, San Marcos, Kyle, Buda, Umland, and southwest Travis County--all areas with lower Composite Demand. There are many high-priority trail examples with multi-jurisdictional buy-in that are provided in the 2009 City of Austin Urban Trails Master Plan. These trails were removed from consideration by CAMPO after local citizen processes and multi-jurisdictional agreements were made. Central Austin should be shown with more regional routes on p. 1-20.

This plan was built to coordinate and incorporate local efforts into a regional vision. If there are corridors not included in the regional priority network it does not preclude the local entities from submitting those plans as part of CAMPO or other funding calls.

b. Inclusion of the Red Line Trail, including the segment from Downtown Austin to The Domain, on p. 1-20 would help increase the network density in Central Austin. This trail is identified in both the 2007 Capital Metro Rail-with-Trail Feasibility Study and in the 2009 City of Austin Urban Trails Master Plan. However, despite public buy-in as demonstrated in published plans by both Capital Metro and the City of Austin, this route is not shown on p. 1-20. The Red Line Trail should be included in its entirety on p. 1-20.

Capital Metro instructed CAMPO not to include the entirety of the Red Line trail due to it being very conceptual and its funding and construction is in the very long-term.

c. The need for a regional route connecting Central Austin to areas just west of Webberville is identified on p. 1-15. Travis County and TxDOT both have identified inclusion of a shared-use path along FM 969. However, despite public input (2012 Travis County Transportation Plan) and buy-in from both Travis County and TxDOT, this route is not shown on p. 1-20. The FM 969 shared-use path should be included in its entirety on p. 1-20.

This route was not included in the priority network because it was not requested as an addition by Travis County until September 20, after recommendation of the plan by ATAC on which Travis County serves as member. However, it is still shown as a planned facility in the network.

d. Additional need is also identified in the Composite Demand map to connect Del Valle with an area just north of the Colorado River (and just west of Webberville) and then further north to Manor. TxDOT has already identified a bike-ped route in right-of-way along SH 130 and in right-of-way along FM 973. The SH 130 and FM 973 shared-use paths should be included in their entirety on p. 1-20.

TxDOT did not request this as an addition to the priority network.

e. Gilleland Creek Trail in Travis County should also be included on the map on p. 1-20 as a near-term route. The right-of-way for this trail is on the ballot for the Travis County Bond Election for November 2017. The need is also demonstrated in the Composite Demand map on p. 1-15.

This route was not included in the priority network because it was not requested as an addition by Travis County until September 20, after recommendation of the plan by ATAC which Travis County serves as member. However, it is still shown as a planned facility in the network.

f. Other regional routes indicated in local and TxDOT plans and major existing bike-ped facilities throughout the metro are missing as well, e.g. the I-35 shared-use paths through Hays County Travis County, and Williamson County, RM 2222 shared-use path between MoPac and Loop 360, and other shared-use paths.

The routes were not requested to be included as priorities by the owning agencies.

3. Numerous plans and policies are cited in Appendix B, "Overview of Ordinances and Regulations", e.g. City of Austin Urban Trails Master Plan, Bastrop County Trails Plan. Citizens also provided input directly to CAMPO to include many of these plans in the RATP. However, many routes in these plans, suitable for federal funding, are not included in the 25-year maps in the draft RATP. Why are these routes not included?

The included routes were submitted by local governments using a thorough, extensive process to gather information from future project sponsors. The RATP is the first of its kind for the region and, in the case for planning for a quickly growing region, is a snapshot in time. CAMPO will be launching a plan/project viewer that will allow maintaining and displaying the most up to date plan and project information as an ongoing practice.

4. The map on 1-20 is a skeleton map and does not reflect where we should be in 2045. The map should be much more ambitious and should also include most arterial roads and highways in the CAMPO area.

The plan will be continuously updated between now and 2045 as new data is provided for the plan. In addition, there will be many local planning efforts that will reflect the needed system densities as identified by local entities. This plan was not meant to replace local initiatives, but to show regional connectivity, and show how local networks connect to the regional system.

5. The Composite Demand maps and analysis described in Chapters 1 & 2 do not make clear if the analyzed demand refers to present conditions or for the year 2045, which is the year the plan is targeted for. If the analyzed demand is for 2045, then that should be stated clearly. If the analyzed demand refers to present demand, then this is actually a 2017 plan, not a 2045 plan.

The demand maps are a snap shot of current conditions, and used as a general guide for developing a network to meet the long-term needs of our area.

6. Regarding Chapter 2, “Regional Active Transportation Network”: The methodology is not clear or spelled out. There is no supplemental appendix to explain the detail on how each step was made from map to map.

CAMPO staff disagrees with this assertion. Pages 2-2 through 2-7 (specifically page 2-6) of Chapter 2 provide the steps taken, data relied upon, and calculations conducted in the creation of the various maps presented. CAMPO staff is happy to answer any specific questions about the methodology used.

7. Include a metro-wide (CAMPO area) trails master plan. CAMPO assured the public that it would create a metro-wide trails master plan in previous CAMPO 25-year plans, e.g. the 2035 CAMPO Plan. (For reference, note that the terms “trails”, “urban trails”, and “shared-use paths” are mostly synonymous.)

As the region has grown and changed since the passage of the 2035 RTP, so has the composition, policies, and priorities of CAMPO’s Transportation Policy Board (TPB). Yet, the commitment toward active transportation in the region continues with the adoption of the RATP.

8. The RATP should include a map showing where bicycling would most help address motor vehicle congestion.

The purpose and intent of the plan is to detail steps the region can take to make walking and biking a more viable transportation option.

9. It is not clear in the draft RATP how active transportation projects will be selected or prioritized, aside from the general map shown on 1-20. Please describe the project prioritization process.

This will be decided as part of CAMPO’s TPB action on the project selection criteria.

10. The RATP should include a plan to count bicycling and walking trips in specific areas and on specific roads/trails/sidewalks throughout the region. CAMPO could simply compile data from all of its constituent entities (including counties, municipalities, TxDOT, CTRMA, Capital Metro, CARTS, UT Austin, ACC, ISD’s, etc.), but would also need to ensure that all constituent entities are capturing the data.

This comment is noted while also being mindful of the fact that CAMPO is here to work with local governments and agencies on planning efforts, not mandate their local efforts, as all entities within the CAMPO region have different needs and available resources.

11. To aid in transparency and utility, please provide the source plan and jurisdiction for each regional route segment recommended. These route segments are listed in multiple places, e.g. pp. C-2 to C-14 and in the maps in Chapter 1 & 2.

This information will be included in the CAMPO’s project viewer metadata.

12. In the list of ideas for CAMPO-area local jurisdictions to consider on pp. 1-10 and 3-35 under “Safety”:

a. Add: Vision Zero Policy and Vision Zero Plan

This was added to the policy review as part of the final draft.

b. Add: Safe Passing Ordinance, i.e. that motor vehicle operators must pass no closer than 3 feet or 6 feet when overtaking a pedestrian, cyclist, or other vulnerable road user.

This was not added as the policy review was not meant to include every single best practice but provide general guidance.

c. Remove references to helmets that could be interpreted as helmet law recommendations. Mandatory helmet laws have repeatedly been shown to both reduce bicycle safety and bicycle usage. There are also other demonstrated negative side-effects to mandatory helmet laws such as enforcement practices that oppress people of color.

The RATP language has already been modified accordingly based on feedback received during the comment period.

13. The Selection Charts provided on pp. 5-4 & 5-5 do not cite references or any indication of how they were derived. How were these derived? Please add sources or explanation.

This has already added to the final draft based on feedback received during the comment period.

14. Transit: There is almost no mention in the draft RATP of the interface and synergy between walking and transit, and between bicycling and transit. Those metro areas that have great success with active transportation also make good use of the interface with transit, and those metro areas that have great success with transit also make good use of the interface with active transportation.

This is discussed in the pattern book and case study. It will also be discussed in more detail in the Regional Transit Study. CAMPO recognizes the importance of transit and active transportation being cohesive and, because of this, was sure to include Capital Metro as a member of the ATAC.

15. Crash data analysis on p. 3-9 is questionable. For example, the claim that “the rate of crashes is declining”, has at least two problems. Firstly, only two data points are chosen, 2011 and 2014, which is not adequate to demonstrate a trend. Secondly, to demonstrate a “rate”, one needs to know the bicycle and pedestrian traffic volume or the number of bicycle and pedestrian trips, yet there is no traffic volume or number of trips cited. Another problem with this analysis is that there is no contextual comparison made. For example, is the number of injury crashes a significant local health issue? How does the number compare to motor vehicle crashes? How can decision-makers and the public understand what amount of resources are warranted to reduce the number of injury collisions? How does the number compare to other metro areas? Does CAMPO have any goals for traffic safety? How are crashes that are not included in the TxDOT dataset addressed in the CAMPO analysis?

The RATP is a snap shot in time using data available at the time of the study, and it will be up to implementing entities to consider context and local needs in any projects. Analysis such as level of comfort, dangerous intersections, and crash rates were included in this planning process. Safety will be considered further as CAMPO develops its performance measures for the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan.

16. The creative and new research on different communities and demographics in the draft RATP Chapter 3 is a welcome addition to CAMPO-area planning.

The RATP would not have been possible without the collaboration, participation, and assistance from CAMPO’s member jurisdictions. CAMPO appreciates their hard work and input on this plan and looks forward to continuing working with them as we all address growth in our region.

17. The Pattern Book contains many good elements. However, due to its complexity, it requires more review. It would be helpful to include a bibliography in the RATP of various guides, e.g. from NACTO.

Sources are included in the RATP text.

18. Coordinate more closely with CAPCOG and other allies on transportation demand management, especially as it relates to active transportation. This should be included in the RATP.

This is part of the role of the CAMPO TAC subcommittee structure and outreach activities.

19. Work with City of Austin, CAPCOG, and other allies to update the CAMPO-area consumer bike map and to print a new edition, as an update to the 2012 First Edition. See p. 5-15 under “Maps” for available funding sources. This should be included in the RATP.

This comment is noted.

20. Establish an ongoing role for the Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC). Include an opportunity for citizen engagement at each meeting of the ATAC.

This is already underway.

21. The RATP should include a Regional Complete Streets policy to ensure seamless movement between jurisdictions within the CAMPO area.

This is a policy decision for CAMPO's TPB.

22. The RATP should include a Regional Vision Zero plan.

This is a policy decision for CAMPO's TPB.

23. Bike Share is only mentioned ad hoc and in the transportation user profiles. The draft RATP includes no description or plan for how bike share will be expanded. A plan for bike share expansion should be included in the RATP.

This is a local initiative so will be up to local jurisdictions to implement or expand current services.

24. The draft RATP is very light regarding pedestrian mobility. We request that more substantial thought be given to pedestrian mobility. For example, include goals for pedestrian mobility such as miles of sidewalks to be completed. We recommend considering the Austin Pedestrian Advisory Council's (PAC) requests for more information.

Pedestrian issues are very difficult to cover at the regional level but the RATP does what is possible at a regional level to address pedestrian needs. Any data received as part of the initial facility inventory is expected to be included in the project viewer.

25. Include a Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The 2017 Texas Strategic Highway Safety Plan includes a specific request that MPO Transportation Policy Councils develop and adopt Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plans.

This is a policy decision for CAMPO's TPB.

26. Include the full inventory of sidewalks from the 2016 City of Austin Sidewalk Master Plan.

The CAMPO RATP is not meant to, nor does it, replace comprehensive local plans. The RATP's focus is important regional connections so local jurisdictions can coordinate their plans with others in the region to create a cohesive, regional active transportation network.

27. Specify in the RATP that CAMPO maintain at least one Permanent Full-Time-Equivalent Bicycle & Pedestrian Staff Member.

This is a policy decision for CAMPO's TPB. However, Kelly Porter is CAMPO's regional Ped/Bike Planner.

28. The Near Northwest Corridor Study conducted by CAMPO (funded by CTRMA) should be included in the RATP.

This is included as an appendix to the RATP.