

## Exhibit C – Staff Response to Board, Commission and Associated Entity Recommendations

Exhibit C for the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) displays the staff response to recommendations received from City Boards, Commissions and Associated Entities regarding the final draft Austin Strategic Mobility Plan.

Each recommendation has a unique identifier, located in the “**ID**” Column. Staff noted which part of the ASMP the comment applies to, and which page within the document; these are noted in “**Type**” and “**ASMP Page Number**,” respectively. The language staff received from the Board or Commission is in “**Change Proposed**,” and the specific body making the recommendation is in the “**Proposed By**” column. Staff’s response to each recommendation is in the “Staff Response” column.

The “**Notes**” column includes where a staff-supported change can be found in Exhibit B. For some recommendations it also includes clarification or additional staff response.

There are four types of responses:

1. Staff supports this change.  
Staff incorporated these recommendations into the ASMP, and the ID number in the “Notes” column shows where and how staff incorporated the comment within *Exhibit B – staff proposed changes*.
2. Staff supports elements of this change.  
Some recommendations included multiple comments. The ASMP team has incorporated some, but not all, of these recommendations. Recommendations that were supported by staff can be referenced by using the Exhibit B ID number located in the notes column.
3. Staff does not oppose.  
Staff does not believe these recommendations require additions to the ASMP. Many of these recommendations are already included in the document, and/or are current practices with the City, and no change is needed. Some recommendations also fall outside the scope of the document or required more specificity.
4. Staff does not support this change.  
Staff has not incorporated these elements into the ASMP, and the “Notes” column provides background or reasoning as to why.

This document is up to date as of March 22 and there are some recommendations staff is still reviewing.

On Thursday, March 28, revised versions of Exhibits B and C will be posted, which will include the anticipated Planning Commission recommendation and staff’s response to any existing Board and Commission recommendations still warranting response.

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-1	Map	Various	Remove SH45SW highway improvements, the MoPac South Express Lanes, the expansion of Escarpment Blvd, and the extension of South Bay Lane.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-13
C-2	Policy	43664	Change the language in Policy 1 from “Manage for safe speeds” to “Design and manage for safe speeds” as a City of Austin value statement.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-6
C-3	N/A	N/A	Require a transportation safety analysis for every infrastructure and development project that reflects existing infrastructure and collision problems, as well as induced demand and actual travel speeds, and truly prioritizes transportation safety with respect to design decisions and transportation funding (Consistent with Action Item 158 – Health Impact Assessments).	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-48
C-4	Action Items	269	Update Action Item 9 to state: “Develop a comprehensive data-driven approach to speed management to evaluate systemwide speeds and make recommendations for reforming speed setting methodology, implementing countermeasures to address streets with documented speeding concerns, and adopting street design guidelines that help achieve targeted operating speeds systemwide, <u>with no design speed to exceed 35 MPH. This action item will be prioritized and implemented as soon as possible.</u> ”	Urban Transportation Commission		
C-5	Action Items	N/A	Car-Free Zones – Add an Action Item for determining a process to consider whether / how a right of way might be converted to a car-free space (e.g. Speedway on UT Campus)	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-44

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-6	Action Items	270	With respect to Action Item 21, update the Land Development Code related to housing and transit-supportive density to: o Increase density not just on identified transit-friendly corridors but within ¼ mile of those corridors to further shift mode choice away from single-occupancy vehicles; transition zones from corridor should reflect Imagine Austin and extend one to four blocks on either side of the corridor; o Increase residential zoning to more ably address the housing affordability crisis and provide more options (including “missing middle” housing); o Incentivize shared driveways for all types of development to both reduce impervious cover and better manage access points along roadways.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-24
C-7	Action Items	270	With respect to Action Item 21, update the Land Development Code related to parking to: o Eliminate parking minimums in all land use categories throughout the City, particularly in areas that are supported by high-frequency transit and/or identified as Imagine Austin Activity Corridors, as a means to achieving mode split and climate change goals (Consistent with Action Item 164 – Reduce Impacts of Global Warming); o Support any opportunity for sites to reduce parking requirements.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not support this change.	
C-8	Action Items	270	Insert new action item after Action Item 22 to state: “Plan for downtown growth. Plan and zone for the downtown and the university to grow in both residential and employment density as fast as the region’s growth or faster.” Downtown is a special part of the transportation network as the one part of the city that can reach and be reached by public transportation to and from anywhere in the city that is on public transportation. The existence of the downtown housing and job cluster makes it much easier for job movers and two-earner households to find transit-supportive residential and job locations.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Austin Core Transportation Plan is underway. Zoning is beyond the scope of the ASMP.

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-9	Action Items	271	Update Action Item 26 to include new bullets: o “Eliminate the exemption of above-grade parking facilities from FAR.” This exemption acts as a form of a parking subsidy. o “Replace existing parking opt-out incentives with other incentives.” Current land development code in certain zoning areas (e.g. VMU, UNO, etc.) allows developers to provide less parking by providing affordable housing and other community benefits; other incentives will need to be provided.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not support this change.	
C-10	Action Items	271	With respect to Action Items 27, 28, and 32, empower staff to set and adjust parking rates as necessary to achieve average occupancy rates no greater than 85 percent per blockface, reflecting a main implementation item in the Downtown Austin Parking Strategy document.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Concept is captured in Action Item 32 and is an indicator under Parking.
C-11	Action Items	271	Update Action Item 28 to state: “Identify and implement geographical Parking and Transportation Management Districts <u>as the preferred method of managing parking demand in excess of on-street parking supply</u> in coordination with local business and neighborhood districts.”	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not support this change.	
C-12	Action Items	271, 274	Develop priorities for locating dockless vehicle parking (including bicycles) within the curb-to-curb spaces (including existing on-street parking spaces) to not reduce available sidewalk space as part of Action Items 32 and 61.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-26 and B-31
C-13	Policy	36	Amend Policy 1 (“Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network”) to direct that all land use processes and decisions adopt minimum targets of transit-supportive densities along the High-Capacity Transit Network appropriate for the transit mode planned. Average densities for the lines should achieve a “High” rating for the immediate portion of the High-Capacity Transit Network and a “Medium-High” rating for the evolving portion of the network, and be based on the recommended density levels in the Puget Sound Transit-Supportive Densities and Land Uses study.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not support this change.	Directing land use processes is outside the scope of the ASMP.  Transit-supportive densities is discussed on pg. 36. See Action Item 22 on coordinating corridor and land use planning.

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-14	Action Items	N/A	An action item should be created to create and adopt a comprehensive transit-oriented development strategy for new planning along the entire High Capacity Transit Network, and an indicator showing the progress towards completing those plans. The plan should include developing pedestrian-friendly infrastructure to support walkable neighborhoods near transit.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	This is currently being done with Planning and Zoning with the first corridor being N Lamar, see Action Item 22.
C-15	Indicators	N/A	Establish indicators and targets for the amount of parking per-capita within ½ mile of the High Capacity Transit Network and Transit Priority Network. Develop targets in cooperation with Capital Metro to advantage parking metrics in Federal Transit Administration grant applications. Create an action item to work with Planning and Zoning Department to develop parking requirements as part of the Land Development Code re-write to achieve targets.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	See Parking Indicator on pg. 43 on decreasing parking spaces per capita. Establishing targets for all indicators is part of Action Item 225.
C-16	Action Items	274	Update Action Item 65 to state: “ <u>Ensure Council Strategic Direction 2023 calls for the construction of all high and very high priority sidewalk segments and address ADA barriers and gaps in the sidewalk system according to the Sidewalk Plan/ADA Transition Plan.</u> ”	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not support this change.	The strategies for the Mobility Outcome are informed by the ASMP and are not yet adopted by Council.
C-17	Action Items	275	Update Action Item 72 to state: “Develop a prioritization process for the design and construction of new roadway connections and capacity projects. <u>New roadway capacity projects shall be built only to places entitled or built to transit-supportive densities. New connectivity projects shall include multimodal connectivity. New connections should have a projected decrease in system Vehicle-Miles Traveled (VMT).</u> ”	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-32
C-18	Action Items	275	Revise the text of Action Plan Item 73 to “Develop projects that increase person capacity on our roadway system at strategic locations to manage congestion, facilitate emergency response, and provide connectivity, <u>but not at the expense of achieving mode share goals. Lane additions and roadway widening along the Transit Priority Network and Bicycle Priority Network must first dedicate space to building that segment of the networks.</u> ”	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-33

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-19	N/A	N/A	Where right-of-way is constrained, prioritize bicycle and transit improvements over roadway improvements for private automobiles.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	
C-20	N/A	N/A	Update the bicycle supply goals to be as ambitious as the Austin Bicycle Master Plan.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-20
C-21	N/A	N/A	Commit to the proposed Bus Rapid Transit network proposed as part of the Project Connect plan	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. The ASMP supports the Project Connect plan.
C-22	Policy	128	Update text regarding Emerging Mobility Solutions (page 128) to state: “Emerging technologies include new modes of vehicular travel, like scooters, connected and automated vehicles, <u>neighborhood electric vehicles</u> , and <u>pedicabs</u> . They also include innovation in operating our transportation network, such as sensors and communication systems.” Reflect these changes in Action Items 115-124.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-7
C-23	Indicators	55	Establish per-capita VMT as an indicator and develop periodic targets to hit to achieve the 50/50 mode split by the conclusion of the ASMP term. Apply indicator/target throughout the ASMP as appropriate.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	Per-capita VMT is included in the ASMP as an indicator, see page 55. Establishing a VMT target is included in Action 225.
C-24	Policy	90	Amend Policy 4 (“Increase the person-carrying capacity of the highway system”) to state that it is the policy of the City of Austin that all highway improvements that correspond with the Commuter Transit Service should have access for buses that is separate from traffic (e.g. as part of an HOV lane, tolled lane, etc.), that highway entrances and exits be configured to allow the smooth and efficient entrance and exit of Commuter Transit Service near stations, and that this is a top priority when dealing with regional and state transportation agencies.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-8

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-25	Policy	96	Amend Policy 1 (“Give public transportation priority”) to give the city traffic engineer authority to initiate a process to dedicate lanes to transit whenever the lane dedication would substantially improve the efficiency of moving people through a corridor. The traffic engineer shall give notice to City Council on the proposed dedication and give Council 90 days to overrule the dedication, and may otherwise move forward with the dedication. (This process is similar to the bike lane dedication process.)	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not support this change.	Transportation operations is under the authority of the City's traffic engineer.
C-26	Action Items	N/A	Develop an action item to create the framework and metrics for periodic review of corridors on the High Capacity Transit Network and initiation of lane dedication.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Item 83 - Transit Enhancement Program.
C-27	Policy	100	Amend Policy 4 (“Invest in a high-capacity transit system”) to state that it is the City of Austin’s policy to pursue any and all funding opportunities to make effective investments in high-capacity transit systems.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Financial Strategies Policy 2 and Policy 4.
C-28	Action Items	N/A	Add an action item for ATD to work with Capital Metro to determine the investment required to achieve mode split goals by the conclusion of the ASMP term.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Intent is captured in Action Items 242 and 243. Also see Financial Strategies Policy 4.
C-29	Policy	100	Amend Policy 4 (“Invest in a high-capacity transit system”) and the Public Transportation System Map (pg. A16) to designate the “Dedicated Transit Pathway” network as the “High Capacity Transit Network (immediate)” and incorporate the “BRT-lite” network into the High Capacity Transit Network as the “High Capacity Transit Network (evolving)”. While the immediate part of the network is the highest priority for investments and planning, the evolving part of the network is also a high priority.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-3

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-30	Policy	N/A	State that it is city policy that the High Capacity Transit Network (Evolving) lines be transitioned to full dedicated-pathway status with high service-level Bus Rapid Transit by the completion of the ASMP term (2039). This policy should guide actions to identify opportunities both immediate (e.g. re-striping lanes downtown to be dedicated transit pathways) and longer-term (e.g. future bond issues or federal funding applications). Land use planning should also anticipate the future complete High Capacity Transit Network and plan transit-supportive development appropriate to a Bus Rapid Transit along the network corridors.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-3
C-32	Action Items	279	Update Action Item 132 to state: “Develop guidance, evaluate, and implement pedestrian crossing improvements, including leading pedestrian intervals and pedestrian scrambles at signalized intersections with high pedestrian volumes <u>and signalized crossings at areas with high potential for pedestrian crossings.</u> ”	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-36
C-33	Action Items	281	Move away from “level of service” language in Action Item 159 – Walkability and Bikeability Evaluations. Focus on separate evaluations for roadway segments and for intersections treatments.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-37
C-34	Action Items	282	Update Action Item 164 from “Reduce impacts of global warming” to “Require compliance with the Austin Climate Protection Plan.” Description should include "Require and enforce policy and planning as necessary to reach the outcomes and objectives of the Austin Climate Protection Plan."	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-38
C-35	Action Items	285	Before Action Item 207, insert a new accessibility action item that states: “Complete Accessibility: Accessibility in transportation shall include all modes at all hours of the day and night.”	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-9

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*



Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-36	Action Items	287	<p>As part of Action Item 234, require that the updated Transportation Criteria Manual reflect the following goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Transportation Impact Analyses should focus less on peak 15-minute period traffic congestion and more on aligning with larger plans and goals, such as the ASMP, Vision Zero, active transportation plans and goals, and Capital Metro operating and capital plans;</li><li>o Specifically, remove intersection level of service (LOS) as a metric and include VMT per person-trip and target mode share as replacements to better align analyses with the City’s goals;</li><li>o Change the language of these analyses to reflect person trips and not vehicle trips;</li><li>o Create and/or adopt a person trip generation model specific to the City of Austin that includes the specific context of the development and location and has as its major output person trip generation by mode;</li><li>o In the event that any parking requirements are maintained, create a parking generation model specific to the City of Austin that includes the specific context of the development and location;</li><li>o Incentivize low VMT per person-trip and high non-SOV mode share developments;</li><li>o Re-examine the Rough Proportionality and cost-sharing requirements to more directly reflect the impact of the development and not the cost of historical infrastructure;</li><li>o Focus on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies rather than supply-side improvements (LOS analysis);</li><li>o Develop TDM standards for development that focus on the inclusion of TDM elements rather than trip reduction results;</li><li>o Develop a TDM model specific to the City of Austin that predicts the impacts of TDM strategies.</li></ul>	Urban Transportation Commission		
C-37	N/A	N/A	Expedite development review for projects strongly align with Austin Strategic Mobility Plan goals.	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not oppose.	More specificity is needed.

Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-38	N/A	N/A	Design Speeds – Target design speeds should not exceed 35 mph	Pedestrian Advisory Council		See A data-driven and context-sensitive approach identifies the design speed during project development.
C-39	Action Items	269	Speed Management – Prioritize Action Item #9 (Speed Management Guidelines) and implement it as soon as possible	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff does not support this change.	Staff does not recommend prioritizing action items as all are important and are dependent on available funding and resources.
C-40	Action Items	274	Sidewalk Construction – Ensure Council Strategic Direction 2023 achieves Action Item #65 (Sidewalk Construction)	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff does not oppose.	The strategies for the Mobility Outcome are in draft form and are not yet adopted by Council.
C-41	N/A	N/A	Sidewalk Plan – Expand Sidewalk Plan / ADA Transition Plan to fund all missing sidewalks in the City	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. The Sidewalk Plan/ADA Transition Plan and ASMP identify all missing sidewalks. The ASMP and Sidewalk Plan guide, but do not allocate, funding to sidewalks.
C-42	N/A	N/A	Latent Demand and Signalization – Consider where to change signal timing include areas that may not currently have high pedestrian levels but could have a latent demand if prioritization of signalization were to change.	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-36
C-43	Policy	N/A	Accessibility – The definition of accessible and safe transportation network include all modes at all hours of the day and night	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-9
C-44	Action Items	N/A	Car Free Zones – Add an Action Item for determining a process to consider whether / how a right of way might be converted to a car free space (e.g. Speedway on UT Campus)	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-44
C-45	Policy		Missing Middle Mobility – The emerging mobility solutions summary text should include Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEVs) and Pedicabs because they are safer transportation choices in pedestrian zones due to their small size, low weight and speed	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-7

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-46	N/A	N/A	Ped Bike Transit Connections – Ensure that new road connections are not exclusively vehicular and can also include exclusively pedestrian and bike connections	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff does not oppose.	New roadway connections would incorporate multimodal elements, per updated street design standards in the Transportation Criteria Manual. New roadways identified in the Street Network Table would be evaluated at the time of project development and no-build and bicycle/pedestrian connection-only options would be considered.
C-47	N/A	N/A	Sprawl and Roadways – New roadways should only be built connecting areas with transit supportive densities, whether as-built or entitled	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff does not support this change.	
C-48	Action Item	275	Sidewalk Obstructions – Achieve Action Item #69 (Vegetative Obstruction and Removal Program) within 3 years and develop policies to ensure motor vehicles do not obstruct the pedestrian right of way	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-45 Prioritization for action items is not part of the ASMP.
C-49	N/A	N/A	encourage trip consolidation such as combining as many trips together as possible;	Environmental Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-10
C-50	N/A	N/A	encourage lighting at intersections to improve crosswalk visibility in compliance with Dark Skies where possible	Environmental Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-23
C-51	N/A	N/A	provide additional education regarding potential air quality standards non-attainment	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	See Air and Climate subchapter introduction on page 184.
C-52	Action Item	287	provide success measures for key indicators and targets	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Item 225 to set benchmarks and targets for all indicators within one year of plan adoption.
C-53	N/A	N/A	implement holistic green infrastructure into the proposed upgrades and the Transportation Criteria Manual	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Item 185. Green Infrastructure discussed in Land and Ecology Policy 2 and Policy 4.
C-54	N/A	N/A	ensure that tree planting standards for right-of-way (ROW) align with City Arborist advice on appropriate spacing and anti-compaction techniques to ensure a healthy urban forest	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Items 182, 184, and 185.

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-55	Action Item	185	ensure metrics and design standards maximize the optimized provision of ecosystem services	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Items 182, 184, 185, and 225.
C-56	N/A	N/A	evaluate overall ROW requirements; as well as ROW requirements for current roadway classifications and ROW trees in areas of proposed improvements;	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	The Street Network Table, included as part of the ASMP, is a reevaluation of the necessary ROW requirements for all Level 2 streets and above, as well as any new Level 1 streets.
C-57	N/A	N/A	provide necessary infrastructure such as public showers and showers in new offices to promote bicycle opportunities and other transportation alternatives;	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Item 34.
C-58	N/A	N/A	encompass all available technology and use the diversity of innovation that is available throughout the City	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed.
C-59	N/A	N/A	incorporate sustainability with all tree planting criteria in the transportation plan and manuals	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Items 182, 184, and 185.
C-60	N/A	N/A	incorporate no-idle zones in the overall plan	Environmental Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-41
C-61	N/A	N/A	identify and track non-work related trips	Environmental Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-43
C-62	N/A	N/A	promote the use of electric bicycles and educate the public on available rebates for electric bicycles	Environmental Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Items 167, 168, 171, 202.
C-63	N/A	N/A	Involve the community, agencies serving seniors, and the Commission on Seniors to ensure the needs of seniors are met in implementing the plan.	Commission on Seniors	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed.
C-64	N/A	N/A	The following areas should be prioritized to meet the needs of seniors: Pedestrian Safety, adequate Street Lighting, enhanced Sidewalk construction and maintenance throughout all the City, adequate ADA compliant parking spaces, longer and safer street crossing times on busy streets, and more options for innovative transit use for seniors all over the City.	Commission on Seniors	Staff does not support this change.	Prioritization for action items is not part of the ASMP.

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-65	N/A	N/A	Consider the creation of a "Pedestrian Safety Zone"-a lowering of speed limits (similar to school zones) wherever there is extensive pedestrian traffic such as hospitals, senior centers, or community centers.	Commission on Seniors	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Item 9 regarding a comprehensive data-driven approach to speed management and Action Item 20 to support legislative efforts to support slower default speed limits.
C-66	Action Items	271	Amend Action Item #26 (parking) to specify that the item refers to non-accessible parking and clarify that even with reduced or zero parking there will be adequate ADA compliant spaces. In addition, the Commission suggests inclusion of temporary use parking spaces available for the safe pick up and drop off of riders who may not be able to use public transportation and rely on rides from a friend or family member, TNC, volunteer driver program, shuttle bus, etc.	Commission on Seniors	Staff supports this change.	See B-25
C-67	Action Items	272	Expand Action Item# 35 (TDM website) to recognize that not all riders have access to or skills to use the internet.	Commission on Seniors	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-27
C-68	Action Items	N/A	Enable 311 or another appropriate entity with central dispatch capabilities to provide callers with information and assist with scheduling of rides.	Commission on Seniors	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-39
C-69	Action Items	274	Amend Action Item #64 to include reference to voluntary services for the non-driving population (eg. Drive a Senior).	Commission on Seniors	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-11 Also see Action Item 202
C-70	Action Items	285	Amend Action Item# 213 to include offering customer service and sensitivity training to drivers at companies providing service to riders of all ages and abilities.	Commission on Seniors	Staff supports this change.	See B-40
C-71	Action Items	287	Regarding Action Item# 226, include age in the demographic data collected.	Commission on Seniors	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Demographic data collection includes age.
C-72	Glossary	A4	Include in the definition of micromobility Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEVs) and other new and emerging technologies that could serve seniors.	Commission on Seniors	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-7
C-73	Indicators	219	add 30% MFI and 50% MFI in reference to MFI levels	Community Development Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-18

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-74	N/A	N/A	include the concept of mobility justice	Community Development Commission		
C-75	N/A	N/A	include the use of Neighborhood Electric Vehicles.	Community Development Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-7
C-76	Executive Summary	xi	adding a new action item to the executive summary section stating that a near term goal is advancing active transportation initiatives;	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-21
C-77	Action Items	N/A	adding an action item for regular post-implementation review of a representative sample of the all ages and abilities bicycle network to ensure that safety and mobility goals are adequately being met by current design practices;	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-46
C-78	Action Items	N/A	adding an action item for identifying possible streets as Car Free Zones such as pedestrian and bicycle malls or connectivity-focused pocket parks, particularly in areas where the road network is over capacity such as West Campus	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-44
C-79	Action Items	N/A	adding an action item for the Aviation section to create all ages and abilities bicycle access to and between all airport terminals	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-47
C-80	Indicators	N/A	adding a unified timeline section to the ASMP that allows for all metrics to have checkpoints with Austin Transportation and stakeholders at the same time (ASMP currently uses 2020, 2022, 2023, 2026 etc.);	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff does not oppose.	Part of Action Item 225 will be to align and set targets and target years for all indicators.
C-81	Action Item	277	modifying Action Item 95 (Construct bicycle facilities) by adding the following sentence: "Recommit to constructing 50 percent of the short-term all ages and abilities network by 2020, and 100 percent by 2025.";	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff does not support this change.	Staff has recalibrated 2014 Bicycle Plan targets based on growth, opportunities, and funding.
C-82	Map	5	clearer delineation within the High Injury Network to allow for mode specific viewing	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-16

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*

## Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-83	Executive Summary	ix	amended to include a more ambitious bicycle mode share of 10% citywide by 2039	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff does not support this change.	The overall goal of the ASMP is to have a 50-50 mode share split between sustainable modes and drive-alone trips. The individual mode share is a fungible number that should contribute to attaining the overall goal.
C-84	Action Item	N/A	an action item be added to the Designing for Safety section to end the practice of bike lanes terminating at intersections to allow for shared right turn lanes	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-34
C-85	Action Item	N/A	an action item be added to ensure that private developments and redevelopments are required to construct all ages and abilities bike facilities on internal and private roads where automobile traffic is high	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff does not support this change.	Transportation Criteria Manual and Land Development Code are the appropriate documents in which to improve multimodal requirements of private development.
C-86	Discussion	120	explicitly stating on page 120 that urban trails are an important tool to "connect the street grid" to provide additional pedestrian & bicycle connectivity and shorten walking & bicycling distances, inserting this language either in the policy subheading or the description text	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-12
C-87	Discussion	128	recommends listing pedicabs and Neighborhood Electric Vehicles within the "Emerging Mobility Solutions" section, e.g. in the introductory text on page 128	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-7
C-88	Street Network Table	N/A	amending the street network table's desired condition section in the downtown area to replace all shared lanes with protected bicycle lanes. This should include but not be limited to: Colorado St, Brazos St, 9th St and 10th St	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff does not support this change.	
C-89	N/A	N/A	recommends that all quiet streets in the downtown area be either thoroughly modified to prevent their permeability to automobile through traffic or have bicycle lanes added	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff does not support this change.	The Austin Core Transportation Plan is underway is the more appropriate place to evaluate appropriate bicycle facilities downtown.
C-90	Map	114, A17	recommends adding W 29th St between Lamar and Rio Grande to the Bicycle Priority Network as a key link between the Shoal Creek Trail and the Rio Grande Cycle track	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-17

*Additional recommendations are anticipated following further staff analysis and anticipated action from the Planning Commission on March 26.*



Exhibit C - Staff response to all Board, Commission and Associated Entity recommendations

March 22, 2019

ID	Type	ASMP Page Number	Change Proposed	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-91	Action Item	271	<p>recommends with respect to Action Item 26, update the Land Development Code related to parking to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Eliminate parking minimums in all land use categories throughout the City, particularly in areas that are supported by high-frequency transit and/or identified as Imagine Austin Activity Corridors, as a means to achieving mode split and climate change goals (Consistent with Action Item 164 - Reduce Impacts of Global Warming);</li><li>• Support any opportunity for sites to reduce parking requirements;</li><li>• Continue to ensure adequate ADA car parking;</li><li>• Preserve or increase the minimum required parking for bicycles.</li></ul>	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-25
C-92	N/A	N/A	recommends a connected street grid that is open, safe and accessible at all times, including night time hours without curfews for pedestrians and people on bikes	Bicycle Advisory Council	Staff supports this change.	See B-9