

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	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	7, 18	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 Item	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	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-56 Staff does not recommend prioritizing action items as all are important and are dependent on available funding and resources.
C-5	Action Item	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
C-6	Action Item	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 Item	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 supports elements of this change.	See B-25
C-8	Action Item	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 supports elements of this change.	See B-58. The ACT Plan process is currently underway.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-9	Action Item	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 supports elements of this change.	See B-25
C-10	Action Item	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 Item	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.	Staff does not want to state a preferred method to manage parking demand. Context should determine strategies.
C-12	Action Item	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 supports elements of this change.	See B-53 and B-66 Transit-supportive densities is discussed on pg. 36. See Action Item 22 on coordinating corridor and land use planning.
C-14	Action Item	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	Indicator	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 Item	274	Update Action Item 65 to state: “ <u>Ensure Council Strategic Direction 2023 calls for the construction of all high and very high priority</u> sidewalk segments and address ADA barriers and gaps in the sidewalk system according to the Sidewalk Plan/ADA Transition Plan.”	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff does not support this change.	Council-adopted Mobility Outcome includes strategy to fill gaps in the Sidewalk System and ensure functionality of existing sidewalks.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-17	Action Item	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 Item	275	Revise the text of Action Plan Item 73 to “Develop projects that increase vehicle <u>person</u> 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
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.	See discussion of overlapping priority networks on pg xxi-xxii. This should be handled during the project development process.
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, and 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	Indicator	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
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 and Council has the ability to override the decisions.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-26	Action Item	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.
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 Item	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
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 Item	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 Item	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 Item	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 Item	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

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-36	Action Item	287	As part of Action Item 234, require that the updated Transportation Criteria Manual reflect the following goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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; o Change the language of these analyses to reflect person trips and not vehicle trips; 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; 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; o Incentivize low VMT per person-trip and high non-SOV mode share developments; 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; o Focus on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies rather than supply-side improvements (LOS analysis); o Develop TDM standards for development that focus on the inclusion of TDM elements rather than trip reduction results; o Develop a TDM model specific to the City of Austin that predicts the impacts of TDM strategies. 	Urban Transportation Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-64
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.
C-38	N/A	N/A	Design Speeds – Target design speeds should not exceed 35 mph	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-6 and B-56
C-39	Action Item	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 Item	274	Sidewalk Construction – Ensure Council Strategic Direction 2023 achieves Action Item #65 (Sidewalk Construction)	Pedestrian Advisory Council	Staff does not oppose.	Council-adopted Mobility Outcome includes strategy to fill gaps in the Sidewalk System and ensure functionality of existing sidewalks.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
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 Item	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	128	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
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.	The ASMP calls for strategically adding roadways. Facilitating emergency response, improving grid connectivity, and maintaining alignment with Imagine Austin are several reasons why roadways could be added to locations that do not have transit-supportive densities.
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 Staff does not recommend prioritizing action items as all are important and are dependent on available funding and resources.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
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 supports this change.	See B-67
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.
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-67
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.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
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.	Staff does not recommend prioritizing action items as all are important and are dependent on available funding and resources.
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 Item	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 Item	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 Item	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 Item	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 Item	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 Item	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	Indicator	219	add 30% MFI and 50% MFI in reference to MFI levels	Community Development Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-18
C-74	N/A	N/A	include the concept of mobility justice	Community Development Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-52

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
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 Item	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 Item	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 Item	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	Indicator	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
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 targets will be evaluated over time to adjust as necessary.
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	Policy	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

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-87	Policy	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.	The ASMP reflects the designation of streets within the 2014 Bicycle Plan. Updates to the Bicycle Plan can be reflected in future versions of the Street Network Table.
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
C-91	Action Item	271	recommends with respect to Action Item 26, update the Land Development Code related to parking to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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); Support any opportunity for sites to reduce parking requirements; Continue to ensure adequate ADA car parking; Preserve or increase the minimum required parking for bicycles. 	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
<i>Items below are recommendations from the Planning Commission and Joint Sustainability Committee that were added after March 22</i>						
C-93	Policy	45	Right-size future parking supply Remove parking minimums from the land development code (except for accessibility requirements) to encourage to end subsidies for non-sustainable trip options, improve affordability and reduce impervious cover	Planning Commission	Staff does not support this change.	Staff does not think this is a policy-level change. See B-25 for changes to Action Item 26 regarding parking.
C-94	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.	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-3
C-95	N/A	N/A	Include Community Climate Plan as a source for ASMP and include Title VI language	Planning Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-38 and B-68

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-96	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.	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-3
C-97	Action Item	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, potentially as part of a parking benefit district, as appropriate.	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Concept is captured in Action Item 32 and is an indicator under Parking.
C-98	Action Item	274	Sidewalk Construction – Ensure Council Strategic Direction 2023 achieves Action Item #65 (Sidewalk Construction)	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	Council-adopted Mobility Outcome includes strategy to fill gaps in the Sidewalk System and ensure functionality of existing sidewalks.
C-99	N/A	N/A	Sidewalk Plan – Expand Sidewalk Plan / ADA Transition Plan to fund all missing sidewalks in the City	Planning Commission	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-100	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	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-45 Staff does not recommend prioritizing action items as all are important and are dependent on available funding and resources.
C-101	Action Item	275	To Action Item 71: Educate property owners regarding regulations and their responsibilities to maintain portions of the ROW.	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Concept is captured in Action Item 69: "promoting property owner vegetation maintenance responsibilities"

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-102	Policy	36	<p>Plan Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network <u>Use all planning tools to establish</u> Require or incentivize transit-supportive densities along Transit Priority Network corridors appropriate to the transit mode planned</p> <p>Appropriate land use density is the foundation for efficient public transportation; dense urban areas with multiple uses including employment centers, multifamily homes, and commercial uses make high-quality transit services, viable. <u>Transit-oriented development is not just density: a rich mix of land uses and a great public realm with a pedestrian-friendly streetscape and amenities is what causes</u> When more people to live close to transit, <u>which allows</u> transit to can run more often and connect people to more destinations. <u>Establishing transit-supportive development (including densities) along planned investments in high-capacity transit is essential to their success, and to securing federal transit funding, and should be a top planning and investment priority. This can and should dovetail with established city goals to add housing near transit lines, especially housing affordable to Austinites with lower incomes.</u></p> <p><u>The high-capacity transit routes planned in Austin run through different types of built environments, including downtown, commercial centers, already-dense mixed-use neighborhoods, and areas dominated by detached, single-family homes. Transit-supportive densities are measured for routes as a whole, and planning should be flexible to take into account the existing character of neighborhoods and community input to appropriately allocate density within transit corridors, but plans must be projected to achieve the transit-supportive density appropriate for the planned mode of transit. Transit supportive density can be achieved by requiring an appropriate level of density through land-planning efforts and zoning regulations, as well as through development incentives associated with small area planning policies. Encouraging denser development near the Transit Priority Network will foster development patterns which will create compact centers designed to encourage walking and bicycling, and will enable transit-supportive development. The full range of planning tools should be used to establish this density, including zoning reviews, small area plans, density bonuses, affordable housing investments, transit-oriented development zones, and revisions of the land development code, potentially including zone entitlements and bonuses tied to the distance from transit. The city will develop a comprehensive transit-oriented development strategy for the High-Capacity Transit Network to guide private and public investment, develop policy recommendations, establish station-level action items to foster high quality transit-oriented development, and prioritize need to allocate limited resources. The portions of the Transit Priority Network not planned for high-capacity transit should have transit-supportive densities considered in land use planning, but are a lower priority. ...</u></p>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-53
C-102 cont.	Policy	36	<p>...Other sStrategies to encourage this type of development include providing incentives in certain cases or enacting more permissive regulations for developments that go above and beyond base zoning requirements. Direct public investment in and management of redevelopment at major mobility hubs will ensure high levels of community benefits accompany density along the Transit Priority Network. These community benefits should include affordable housing, affordable space for arts, music, “legacy,” and small business uses, civic spaces, and other amenities like “green” design and childcare. <u>Bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and other investments that allow people of all abilities to access transit should also be prioritized along the network. Affordable housing investments near the network should be steered to comply with standards in federal transit funding opportunities as much as possible without sacrificing effectiveness.</u></p> <p><u>Finally, people living downtown and near the University of Texas campus already have the lowest rate of drive-alone trips and vehicle miles travelled, and increasing density in these areas is one of the surest ways to lower that rate city-wide and facilitate increased transit ridership.</u></p>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	B-53
C-103	Action Item	272	[New Action Item] Government employer TDM Strategies: Seek partnerships with various federal and state government agencies and universities that are major employers within the city limits to develop pilots and demonstration projects that encourage telework, transit, and other modes and disincentivizes employees to drive alone.	Planning Commission	Staff supports this change.	See B-54

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-104	Policy	18	<p>Implement NACTO “critical” recommendations for safe design speeds</p> <p>Designing for Safety Policy 1 <u>Design and</u> manage for safe speeds</p> <p>...</p> <p>Our approach to speed management begins with selecting safe target speeds for all streets based on their context. Target speed refers to the speed at which we want cars to drive on the street. Surrounding land uses, traffic volumes, and pedestrian activity all affect the appropriate target speed for a street. The target speeds inform the design speed, which refers to the specific geometric features or elements of a roadway necessary to achieve the target speed. <u>We will use design criteria that are at or below the target speed of a given street.</u> The posted speed limits are set to help communicate and reinforce safe target speeds. After setting the target speed and implementing design speeds, we analyze operating speed, which refers to the observed speed of people using the street.</p> <p><u>The 85th percentile of observed target speeds should fall between 10–30 mph on most urban streets. The maximum target speed for urban arterial streets is 35 mph. Some urban arterials may fall outside of built-up areas where people are likely or permitted to walk or bicycle. In these highway-like conditions, a higher target speed may be appropriate, but the use of higher speeds should generally be reserved for limited access freeways and highways and is inappropriate on urban streets, including urban arterials.</u></p>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-6
C-105	Action Item	269	<p>Implement NACTO “critical” recommendations for safe design speeds</p> <p>Amend Action Item #9 - Speed management guidelines "...and adopting street design guidelines that help achieve targeted operating speeds systemwide. <u>This action item will be prioritized and implemented as soon as possible.</u>"</p>	Planning Commission	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-106	Action Item	269	New action item: Transportation Safety Impact Assessments: Develop criteria and a policy to 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.	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-48
C-107	Action Item	269	<p>Amend Action Item #9 - Speed management guidelines "...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>"</p>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	<p>See B-56</p> <p>Staff does not recommend prioritizing action items as all are important and are dependent on available funding and resources.</p>
C-108	N/A	N/A	Design Speeds – Target design speeds should not exceed 35 mph	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-6 and B-56

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-109	Action Item	269	Speed Management – Prioritize Action Item #9 (Speed Management Guidelines) and implement it as soon as possible	Planning Commission	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-110	Map, Street Network Table	93, A15	[Change Redbud Trl-Enfield Rd Connector] to a two lane road with bike/pedestrian [facilities] way through the Muny golf course.	Planning Commission	Staff does not support this change.	See B-13 Staff proposes removing the Redbud Tr-Enfield Rd Connector instead of changing the capacity of the road. A current study of travel in the area is underway that will determine future needs.
C-111	Action Item	270	Provide specificity to action item for Land Development Code updates for transit-supportive density [Text changes to Action Item 21]: "Update the land development code to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require a more compact and connected street network Revise zones, an immediate zoning map, and/or bonuses to A-allow for and incentivize transit-supportive densities and require a mixture of land uses along the Transit Priority Network <u>and within ½ mile of planned high-capacity transit, in a manner that blends-in with, and is sensitive to, existing forms of housing</u> Allow for missing middle housing types, including mixed-use infill development types 	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-24
C-112	Action Item	270	Provide specificity to action item for corridor-based land use planning [Text changes to Action Item 22]: "Conduct corridor-based land use planning in parallel with corridor mobility planning and implementation to calibrate zoning and land development code requirements with needs, constraints, and opportunities to create cohesive multimodal corridors, quality built environment, and transit-supportive and context-sensitive density scale <u>that is projected to achieve Federal Transit Administration transit supportive density ratings of "Medium-High" (for the Project Connect BRT-Light network) or "High" (for the Project Connect High Capacity Rapid Transit and Commuter Line networks) within ½ mile of planned high-capacity transit investments.</u>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-57
C-113	Action Item	N/A	Create action item for updates to downtown and UNO plans. [Action item title and description:] Update downtown and University Neighborhood Overlay plans Refresh the downtown and University Neighborhood Overlay zoning and land use regulations to allow for greater density to meet mode-share goals.	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-58
C-114	Action Item	N/A	Create action item to implement comprehensive transit oriented development (TOD) strategy. [Action item title and description:] Comprehensive transit oriented development strategy Collaborate with Capital Metro to develop a comprehensive transit oriented development (TOD) strategy, including an implementation action plan and a system to track and monitor success to refine and improve the strategy in the future.	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Staff believes TOD strategies are contained within ASMP.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-115	Indicator	N/A	Create indicator and target on progress in planning transit-supportive density / transit-oriented development around high-capacity transit lines.	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Staff believes this is captured within existing indicators and targets: -number of people living and working within 1/2 mile of Transit Priority Network -number of developments contributing to transit, walking, bicycling, and shared mobility improvements -reduce the number of drive-alone trips generated and vehicle miles traveled by new developments (by shifting trips to other modes and not by decreasing intensity)
C-116	Policy	36	<p>Revise explanation of transit supportive densities to reflect federal grant benchmarks and evidence-based practices [Text changes to highlight box on page 36]</p> <p>Transit-Supportive Densities Population density refers to the amount of people that live, work, or play within a specified geographic area. It is generally measured by people or units per acre. When enough people live, work, or play in an area, it means that public transportation serving the area can be economically, environmentally, and socially efficient.</p> <p>Different contexts, including whether a place is urban or suburban, whether it is residentially- or commercially-focused, and other differences, may require different densities to be transit-supportive. <u>Transit-supportive densities are also different for different levels of transit service; generally the higher the level of investment, the higher the density. Within the urban and suburban contexts of Austin, Capital Metro has defined what transit supportive density levels are. There are three principle sources for appropriate transit-supportive densities: Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant benchmarks and the Puget Sound Regional Council 2015 meta-analysis, "Transit-Supportive Densities and Land Use," address density around high-capacity transit and Capital Metro has standards for general bus service. Both the FTA and the Puget Sound study measure density as an average across an entire transit line - individual segments may have higher or lower densities - which helps give flexibility in planning.</u></p> <p><u>FTA benchmarks are important because their grants are a substantial portion of funding for transit projects. The FTA set them to "ensure that neighborhoods surrounding proposed transit stations have the fundamentals in place to ensure that as service is improved over time there is a mix of housing options for existing and future residents." All projects submitted must achieve the "Medium" density grade to be eligible, and a "Medium-High" or "High" level makes grant proposals more competitive. The FTA measures density in half-miles from transit stations, so transit lines with stops spaced less than a mile apart and final station locations that are not set can be measured along the corridor ½ mile from a transit line, while greater-spaced transit lines or those with set final station locations can be measured in a ½ mile radius around stations. The FTA also takes Central Business District Parking levels into account.</u></p> <p>FTA Criteria Table included ...</p>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-66

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-116 cont.	Policy	36	<p>...The Puget Sound study provides appropriate density ranges for different modes of transit to ensure adequate ridership and costs-per-passenger, and to achieve decreases in BMT and drive-alone trips. These are not thresholds to meet but goals that, as we achieve them, the health of our transit system improves.</p> <p><u>Puget Sound Criteria Table included</u></p> <p><u>Capital Metro measures density ¼ mile from transit corridors that support basic transit service. By achieving these transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network and other existing bus lines, Capital Metro can avoid service changes that eliminate or move routes due to a lack of density and riders.</u></p> <p><u>Capital Metro</u> Residential transit-supportive density: 16 people per acre <u>Capital Metro</u> Commercial transit-supportive density: 8 people per acre</p> <p>(See page 21 of this document for the FTA and Puget Sound tables)</p>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-66
C-117	Policy	88	<p>[Text edit to Policy 1 in Roadway System]</p> <p>Strategically provide new roadway connections and add capacity for vehicles.</p> <p>Identify and develop project that, while helping meet our mode share goals, increase vehicle capacity on our roadway system at strategic locations to manage congestion, facilitate emergency response, and <u>prioritize provide connectivity of our streets for the common good over grid rupture for the benefit of the few</u></p>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-59
C-118	Indicator	N/A	Establish indicators and targets for the amount of parking per-capita within 1/2 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.	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Parking Indicator on pg. 43 on decreasing parking spaces per capita. Establishing targets for all indicators is part of Action Item 225.
C-119	Action Item	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."	Planning Commission	Staff does not support this change.	Staff does not want to state a blanket preferred method to manage parking demand. Context should determine strategies.
C-120	Policy	90	Amend Policy 3 ("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.	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-8

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-121	Maps	93, A15	Remove SH 45 Southwest from the map, currently unbuilt portion.	Planning Commission	Staff does not support this change.	This segment of SH 45 is in the CAMPO 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Staff believes it is important to participate in project planning and development with TxDOT to help achieve the intended goals of Imagine Austin and the ASMP, and recognizing currently-underway projects by other jurisdictions is a way to do this.
C-122	Action Item	N/A	New action item to oppose state or regional authority efforts to expand or connect SH45.	Planning Commission	Staff does not support this change.	This is a decision that should be made by City Council through discussion on the ASMP. The City will need to continue to participate in this discussion during the development of the CAMPO 2045 RTP.
C-123	Policy	21	[Changes to Designing for Safety Policy 3] A built environment that facilitates safe mobility will vary greatly based on context. Infill development may help create compact places, lighting increases safety for all users, and strong access management policies help minimize conflicts at driveways or in parking lots. Developing strong access management policies that address safety at entry and exit points along a roadway is a critical area of focus in this regard. The Federal Highway Administration estimates that comprehensive corridor access management strategies can reduce injury and fatal crashes on urban/suburban streets by up to 30%. <u>City land use policies should require and incentivize reducing the number and size of curb cuts - especially those that interact with the Bicycle Priority Network - including relocating or consolidating driveways.</u> Techniques to do this could include reducing curb cuts to minimize conflicts between modes or consolidating driveways. This means several properties would be accessed through one driveway, and requires joint use easements to allow movement into and out of the site. <u>Driveways with high car volumes should generally not cross the Bicycle Priority Network unless there are no alternatives, and then safety analysis and controls should be implemented.</u>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-60
C-124	Action Item	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.	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-61
C-125	Indicator	79	Change indicator: Increase the percentage of street frontages with sidewalks <u>Decrease the number of years to needed complete sidewalk plan based on current spend levels</u>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-62
C-126	Action Item	N/A	Add Action Item: Sidewalk Capital Scenario Develop a specific schedule and sequence of sidewalk bond referendums and other new funding policies required to meet the ASMP primary objective by 2039	Planning Commission	Staff does not support this change.	Staff does not identify a bond election schedule.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-127	Action Item	N/A	Clarify the use of fee-in-lieu in neighborhoods to effectively require sidewalks and redirect new funds quickly to appropriate locations. Clarify citizen participation.	Planning Commission	Staff supports this change.	B-64
C-128	Action Item	N/A	Coordinate with trash providers and pickup locations (re: subdivision and resubdivision) so that changes do not make trash pickup more detrimental to transportation modes.	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. This is part of ongoing street design and development review processes.
C-129	Action Item	287	Update Action 234: Coordinate with City departments and external stakeholders to update the Transportation Criteria Manual. <u>Including,</u> <u>1. 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 perating and capital plans;</u> <u>2. 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;</u> <u>3. Change the language of these analyses to reflect person-trips and not vehicle trips;</u> <u>4. 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;</u> <u>5. 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;</u> <u>6. Incentivize low VMT per person-trip and high non-SOV mode share developments;</u> <u>7. 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;</u> <u>8. Focus on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies rather than supply-side</u> <u>9. improvements (LOS analysis);</u> <u>10. Develop TDM standards for development that focus on the inclusion of TDM elements rather than trip reduction results;</u> <u>11. Develop a TDM model specific to the City of Austin that predicts the impacts of TDM strategies.</u>	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-64. The TCM is currently being updated, and some recommendations require Land Development Code revisions.
C-130	Action Item	N/A	New action item: Evaluate current new additions (annexations and new subdivisions) to the city, their access to businesses without always driving and the potential for complete communities. Revise codes to ensure that goals are being met and Austin is not simply fostering more single use use sprawl and unwalkable neighborhoods to be built on the fringes of the city.	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-65 and Action Item 48
C-131	Action Item	275	Revise the text of Action Plan Item 73 to "Develop projects that increase <u>person</u> vehicle 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> "	Planning Commission	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-33
C-132	N/A	N/A	Where right-of-way is constrained, prioritize bicycle and transit improvements over roadway improvements for private automobiles.	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	See discussion of overlapping priority networks on pg xxi-xxii. This should be handled during the project development process.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-133	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.	Planning Commission	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Financial Strategies Policy 2 and Policy 4.
C-134	N/A	N/A	Supports adoption and implementation of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan in a manner consistent with and furthering the Austin Community Climate Plan, including coordination of the two plans' transportation-related emissions targets and other goals of the Austin Community Climate Plan.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	See B-38
C-135	N/A	N/A	Reaffirms the call for bolder initiatives to encourage alternatives that reduce greenhouse gas emissions contained in the recommendations passed by the Pedestrian Advisory Council, Urban Transportation Commission, Environmental Commission, and Planning Commission.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	See B-38
C-136	Action Item	282	Update Action Item 164 from "Reduce impacts of global warming" to "Require compliance with the Austin Community Climate Plan." Description should include "Require and enforce policy and planning as necessary to reach the outcomes and objectives of the Austin Community Climate Plan."	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-38
C-137	Action Item	271	With respect to Action Item 26, update the Land Development Code related to parking to: Eliminate parking minimums in high-density 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).	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-25
C-138	N/A	N/A	Make it a clear priority for the use of right of way will be given to public transit, sidewalks and bike lanes.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	See discussion of overlapping priority networks on pg xxi-xxii. This should be handled during the project development process.
C-139	N/A	N/A	Minimize highway and other roadway expansion, in order to reduce climate and other environmental impacts, especially where other multi-modal options are not given equal or priority consideration.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Roadway System Policy 1 and Policy 3 and Land and Ecology Policy 1 and Policy 3
C-140	Action Item	various	Ensure access to and prioritization of multi-modal transportation to historically underserved communities, and specifically: a. Identify and seek additional funding sources to achieve ADA-compliant sidewalks, transit stops, and other infrastructure. b. Update Action Item 65 to state: "Ensure Council Strategic Direction 2023 calls for the construction of all sidewalk segments and address ADA barriers and gaps in the sidewalk system according to the Sidewalk Plan/ADA Transition Plan." c. 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."	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff supports elements of this change.	Staff believes the introductory statement is covered in the Equity section. (a) See Financial Strategies Policy 2 and Policy 4 and Action Item 269. (b) Council-adopted Mobility Outcome includes strategy to fill gaps in the Sidewalk System and ensure functionality of existing sidewalks. (c) See B-9
C-141	Indicator	N/A	Further develop metrics, goals, and timelines for implementation to encourage long-term accountability and opportunities to measure success related to climate resilience and adaptation goals.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	No change is needed. See Action 225.

ID	Type	Page Number	Change Proposed <i>Text in red are changes to this exhibit since March 22</i>	Proposed By	Staff Response	Notes
C-142	N/A	N/A	Encourage trip consolidation.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff supports this change.	See B-10
C-143	N/A	N/A	Provide additional education regarding health and economic implications of potential failure to meet federal air quality standards.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff supports this change.	See B-67
C-144	N/A	N/A	Implement holistic green and climate-friendly infrastructure that promotes resilience and stacked benefits into the proposed upgrades and the Transportation Criteria Manual.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Idea is captured in Land and Ecology Policy 2 and Land Ecology Action Items. Changes to the Transportation Criteria Manual are called for in Action item 234 calls.
C-145	N/A	N/A	Ensure that tree planting standards for right-of-way (ROW) align with City Arborist advice on appropriate spacing, anti-compaction techniques, and appropriate soil volumes to ensure a healthy urban forest, to maximize carbon sequestration and adaptive capacity.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. See Action Items 182, 184, and 185.
C-146	N/A	N/A	Consider improved enforcement and expansion of anti-idling regulations and promote public awareness on the health and environmental impacts of idling.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff supports elements of this change.	See B-67
C-147	N/A	N/A	Promote the use of electric bicycles and educate the public on available rebates for electric bicycles.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Concept included in Action Items 167, 168, 171, 205.
C-148	N/A	N/A	Promote the use of electric vehicles.	Joint Sustainability Committee	Staff does not oppose.	No change needed. Concept included in Air and Climate Policy 2 and Action Items 167, 168, 171, 205.

Federal Transit Administration Density Benchmarks (June 2016)

	<u>Station Area Development</u>		<u>Parking Supply</u>	
<u>Rating</u>	<u>Employment Served by System</u>	<u>Avg. Population Density (per acre)</u>	<u>CBD Typical Cost-Per-Day</u>	<u>CBD Spaces Per Employee</u>
<u>High</u>	<u>>220,000</u>	<u>>23.4</u>	<u>>\$16</u>	<u><0.2</u>
<u>Medium-High</u>	<u>140,000-219,999</u>	<u>15-23.4</u>	<u>\$12-\$16</u>	<u>0.2-0.3</u>
<u>Medium</u>	<u>70,000-139,999</u>	<u>9-14.9</u>	<u>\$8-\$12</u>	<u>0.3-0.4</u>

Puget Sound Regional Council Density Benchmarks (February 2015)

	<u>Light Rail</u>	<u>Bus Rapid Transit / All-day Frequent Bus</u>
<u>Residential Density</u>	<u>16-67+ residents per acre</u>	<u>7-8+ housing units per gross acre</u>
<u>Employment</u>	<u>100,000 - 150,000+ jobs in CBD</u>	<u>(not addressed)</u>
<u>Activity Units</u>	<u>56-116+ residents and jobs per gross acre</u>	<u>17+/- residents and jobs per acre</u>